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RULES AND PROCEDURES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

Faculty Rule 29.3781. Committee on Academic Misconduct.

Section 1. The Committee on Academic Misconduct shall consist of three members of the faculty and the Executive Dean, Student Relations as ex officio. The three faculty members of this committee shall be appointed by the President for a term of three years, the appointments to be annually so that one member retires each year. No faculty member shall serve more than two consecutive terms.

Section 2. It shall be the duty of this Committee to investigate or establish procedures for the investigation of all reported cases of student academic misconduct (which term includes all forms of student academic misconduct whenever committed, including but not limited to, cases of plagiarism and dishonest practices in connection with examinations) and to make recommendations of suitable disciplinary action to the Executive Dean, Student Relations. Each instructor shall report to the Committee all instances of what he believes may be academic misconduct. It shall be the further duty of the Committee to investigate all cases of improper methods of conducting examinations which might tend to promote academic misconduct on the part of students and to make a report of its findings to the Vice President, Instruction and Research. (See Rule 25.65)

Section 3. If, during the course of an examination, a student communicates with another student or uses in his possession a crib or other improper examination aid, he shall be presumed to have been guilty of academic misconduct. The burden shall then be on the student to convince the Committee that he was not, in fact, guilty of academic misconduct.

Section 4. This Committee shall not have jurisdiction over cases involving student academic misconduct in professional Colleges having a published honor code. These Colleges shall follow their own codes in investigating reported cases of academic misconduct and in determining suitable disciplinary action. When the action taken involves suspension, dismissal, or entry on the student's permanent record, a recommendation to that effect shall be made to the Executive Dean, Student Relations, for review and action. In the course of following its own procedures, any professional College may consult with the Committee on Academic Misconduct.

Faculty Rule 35.35. Academic Misconduct.

Students found guilty of academic misconduct, as defined in Rule 29.3781, shall be subject to a penalty imposed by the Executive Dean, Student Relations, upon appropriate recommendation following the procedure outlined in Rule 29.3781.
To Members of the Teaching Staff:

In the spring of 1967, the Faculty Council approved the general outline and at a subsequent meeting heard and discussed the detailed procedures presented hereon.

Dishonest academic practices must be acknowledged and dealt with by a university for these major reasons: (a) The academic standards of the university must be protected. Grades are an index to a student's performance. Undetected and unpunished cheating reduces the accuracy and value of that index, and impairs the university's credit. (b) The student should be helped to get the education which he is asking and paying for. The essence of education is in the work the student does to acquire it. Work appropriated from someone else and offered by the student as his own defeats the purpose of education. Furthermore, proper disposition of a case of detected cheating, whether by imposition of penalty or therapeutic counseling, or both, provides an educative device which becomes an important and proper learning experience. (c) The university has moral as well as educational functions and authority. Cheating, like any other form of theft, is wrong and cannot be condoned by a university.

At The Ohio State University, the authority to deal with academic dishonesty is vested in the Committee on Academic Misconduct. Rule 29.27.21 of the Faculty Regulations provides that the Committee "shall consist of three members of the University Faculty and the Executive Dean for Student Services, or his designee." It is the duty of this committee to investigate all reported cases of academic misconduct... and to make recommendations of suitable disciplinary action to the President," Thus, though it is the faculty's province to determine guilt and recommend appropriate disciplinary action, the final authority to punish is vested in the President's Office.

Rule 29.27.21 also requires that the Committee "investigate all cases of lax or irregular methods of conducting examinations which might tend to promote academic misconduct on the part of students and to make a report of its findings to the President." The faculty, therefore, shares responsibilities with the students in maintaining the integrity of the examining system. To assist the faculty in carrying out this responsibility, the Committee offers suggestions (in sections of this handbook) for the administration of examinations and for paper work outside the classroom.

These professional or graduate colleagues, which have their own codes governing academic misconduct, are exempted from the operation of Rules 29.27.21 and 29.32. However, in the course of following their own procedures, such colleges may consult with this Committee.

The Operation of the Rules

Each case of cheating and plagiarism shall be fully described by the instructor in a written report to the chairman of his department. The department chairman shall endorse the report and transmit it to the chairman of the Committee on Academic Misconduct. Because small details are sometimes important and are easily forgotten, the report should be as complete as possible. The instructor shall attach to his report all relevant documents, such as the crib used in an examination, or the paper of the student from whom the material was copied.

When a theme or report has been plagiarized, all borrowed passages should be set off in square brackets and their location in the original source clearly indicated. Either the original source or a copy of it should be attached to the student's paper.

If the accused is a freshman and if he admits his guilt, the instructor may recommend in his report that hearing of the case by the Committee be waived. Such a report should indicate the academic penalty that has been imposed. But whether the student admits guilt or not, the instructor may request that the case be heard if he believes that Committee action is desirable.

If no previous offense appears on the student's record, the Committee may accept a recommendation that hearing be waived.

When hearing is waived, the Executive Dean shall notify the student that his offense has been recorded in the Dean's files; that administrative disciplinary action has been suspended; that any future offense shall be subject to formal action by the Committee, and that suspension or dismissal may result. When the Committee deems it appropriate, it will send a copy of this letter to the student's parents or guardians.

If hearing by the Committee is waived, the student is still subject to whatever academic penalty the instructor, in consultation with his department chairman, considers appropriate, e.g., reduction of grades or failure in the course.

The student shall always have the right to be heard by the Committee, if he so requests.

A non-freshman who is accused but who has not been previously reported shall be subject either to the procedure above or to Committee action. The choice of the procedure shall be made by the Committee chairman after consultation with the instructor.

No matter what his rank, an accused student who has been involved in a previous case of academic misconduct must be brought to hearing by the Committee. If he is found guilty a second time, he shall normally be subject to suspension or dismissal.

Procedure in Committee Hearings

1. When the Committee receives the report of a case from a department, the Executive Dean appoints a sub-committee to see if the student has been previously reported, and the files of the Dean of Men and Dean of Women are consulted for other data concerning the student's behavior. Thus, all evidence, both favorable and unfavorable, is brought to bear on each case.

2. If it is decided to give the case a hearing, a date is set for a Committee meeting in the Executive Dean's office.

3. The student's letter of notification will define the charge and ask the student to prepare a written statement to be brought to the hearing.

4. Present at the meeting are the student, his instructor (or a representative from his department), the three faculty members (one of whom serves as chairman), the Executive Dean, the Dean of Men or the Dean of Women, the academic Dean's representative (of the student's college who serves for all cases from his college), a member of the University Counseling Center, and a representative from the student Senate. The Dean and the college representative bring to the meeting all records, academic and disciplinary, concerning the accused student.

5. The college representative is an observer, and participates at the discretion of the Committee chairman.

6. As the student's interests are adequately represented, he is not permitted to bring an outside observer of his own choice. However, having been notified that the Dean of Men or Dean of Women, the academic Dean's representative,
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sentative and a staff member of the Counseling Center will be present, he may
speak himself of the counsel and assistance of any one of them in preparation
for his hearing with the Committee.
7. After he is questioned and has been given full opportunity to comment
on his case, the student is excused. He is told that he will be notified of
the Committee's decision by mail.
8. After the case has been discussed by the whole group, the instructor is
excused.
9. The three faculty members and the Executive Dean make the decision
and determine the appropriate action to be taken.
10. Acting for the President, the Executive Dean accepts or rejects the
Committee's recommendation.
11. Copies of the letter reporting the decision are sent to the student, the
instructor, the student's college office, the Dean of Men or the Dean of Women,
and, when appropriate, to the Registrar.
12. If the student is found guilty, the Committee will recommend to the
instructor whatever additional academic penalty it deems appropriate.
13. If the student is dissatisfied with the Committee's decision, he may
appeal to the President.

Definitions of Disciplinary Actions

Academic Penalty (e.g., reduced grade, failure in the course, extra work)
is imposed by the instructor in consultation with his department chairman or
on recommendation of the Committee.

Administrative Actions. Administrative penalty may be imposed only on
recommendation of the Committee to the Executive Dean. The normal types
of such penalty are:

1. "Disciplinary Probation with the Dean of Men or Women" for a stated
length of time. Removal from college in extra-curricular activities may be
suspected during the term of probation. This type of action is recorded in the
Dean's file and may have a temporary notation on the official record.

2. "Official Disciplinary Probation" for a stated length of time. This action
does appear on the student's official record. The student may petition that the
action be removed from his record before graduation, but the actions assessing
probation and removing it normally appear on the official record.

3. "Disciplinary Suspension" for a stated length of time. This action appears
on the student's official record.

4. "Disciplinary Dismissal." This action appears on the student's official
record.

General Comments

This revision of the rules and procedures concerning academic dishonesty
was made partly because the old rules were so rigid and inequitable that the
faculty was reluctant to cooperate with the Committee. In part the revision
was undertaken in order to give further protections to the student and to the
Committee in establishing an adequate system. The new rules are more flexi-
ble to permit leniency with first offenders in general and freshmen in particu-
lar. We believe that most students will learn their lesson when their first
offense becomes a matter of university record. Some will not, however, and
it is therefore important that the faculty cooperate fully in the new system
and report all offenses. Instructors may feel confident that most cases they
report will not be brought to hearing and that they will not often be put to
the unpleasant task of accusing a guilty student in the presence of a committee.

It is imperative, however, that all offenses be recorded in the central disci-
plinary file, for only thus can the committee distinguish—as it must—
between students who merely err and those who are incorrigible.

Cheating is Examination. Some widely accepted preventive measures are
here suggested:

1. Each examination should be effectively proctored, and the examination
room should never be left unattended.

2. When space permits, students should be placed in alternate seats, or
further apart if possible, and in uniform rows from front to rear.

3. At the beginning of all except announced "open book" examinations, the
instructor should require that all books, notebooks, extra examination books,
and items of all kinds be deposited in the front of the room. All study notes
should be removed from pockets and purses.

4. The instructor should announce at the beginning of the examination
that students are expected to remain in the room until they are ready to turn
in their examination papers. Permission to leave the room during the examination
may be granted by the instructor for "good cause." Only see student should be
absent at a time.

5. In objective examinations, it is recommended that two sets of questions
(or the same questions in different order) be distributed to alternate rows of
students.

6. When departmental examinations are administered, all sections should
be scheduled at the same hour. Otherwise, different examinations are abso-
lutely necessary to remove unfair advantages for later sections over students
in the first classes and frequent opportunities for breaking security in ex-
aminations.

7. In the preparation and storage of examination questions, careful secur-
ity measures should be exercised.

8. When a proctor sees what looks like a crib in use, he should take it
from the student immediately, but he must use discretion in determining
whether the student should continue in the examination or be dismissed.

Plagiarism. University education and research are founded upon a knowl-
edge of the difference between legitimate and illegitimate use of other people's
facts and ideas. The student cannot get this knowledge from a brief defini-
tion, he must learn it in the classroom from his teachers, and from books in
which proper citations, references, and quotations illustrate both the technique
and the etiquette of acknowledgment. The teacher should try to prevent
plagiarism not only by instruction but by so managing his assignments that it
will be difficult or pointless.

All undergraduates in the University are required to take one or more
courses in freshman English. The Committee here reprints the instructions
concerning plagiarism which the English Department distributes to every
student. The Committee knows from experience, however, that many students
forget or ignore this instruction, and that it must be repeated in all University
courses which require paper work outside the classroom.
DEFINITION OF PLAGIARISM

The faculty Committee on Academic Misconduct has reproduced herewith the definition and description of plagiarism which appears in original form in the "Theme Folder for English Composition," prepared by the Department of English, The Ohio State University, and copyrighted 1968 by J. R. Weaver. Permission to reproduce the material was secured through the Chairman of the Department, Professor Robert M. Ew frett.

"PLAGIARISM: Every student will be held responsible for reading and understanding the following statement.

"Because the purpose of Freshman English is to improve your ability to express yourself in writing, your themes and exercises must be your own work. To submit to your instructor a paper that is not truly the product of your own mind and skill is to commit plagiarism. To put it bluntly, plagiarism is the act of stealing the ideas and/or the expression of another and representing them as your own. It is a form of cheating and a kind of academic misconduct which can incur severe penalties. It is important, therefore, that you understand what it consists of, so that you will not unintentionally jeopardize your college career."

"Plagiarism, as the English Department defines it, can take several forms. The most obvious form is a word-for-word copying of someone else's work, in whole or in part, without acknowledgment, whether that work be a magazine article, a portion of a book, a newspaper piece, another student's essay, or any other composition not your own. Any such verbatim use of another's work must be acknowledged by (1) enclosing all such copied portions in quotation marks, and (2) by giving the original source either in the body of your essay or in a footnote. As a general rule, you should make very little use of quoted material in your themes. The theme topics in Freshman English are so designed as to make it unnecessary for you to consult anything but your own mind.

"A second form of plagiarism is the unauthorized paraphrasing of the structure and language of another writer's work. Changing a few words of another's composition, omitting a few sentences, or changing their order does not constitute original composition and therefore can be given no credit. If such borrowing or paraphrase is ever necessary, the source must be scrupulously indicated by footnotes.

"Still another form of plagiarism is more difficult to define. It consists of writing a theme based solely on the ideas of another. Even though the language is not the same, if the thinking is clearly not your own, then you have committed plagiarism. If, for example, in writing a theme you reproduce the structure and progression of ideas in an essay you have read, or a speech you have heard, you are not engaging your own mind and experience enough to claim credit for writing your own composition.

"Now then, you may ask, can I be original? Am I to learn nothing from others? There are several answers to such questions.

"Of course, you have come to the University to learn, and this means acquiring ideas and exchanging solutions with others. But no idea is ever entirely new; you merely learned it in the phrasing of somebody else. Only when you have thought through an idea in terms of your own experience can you be said to have learned; and when you have done that, you can develop it as a product of your own mind. It is this mind we are trying to train and evaluate. When, therefore, you are given a theme assignment, do not consult books or articles or friends' themes in search of something to say. If an assignment baffles you, discuss it with your instructor. And if you are directed to use printed sources, in English or in other courses, consult your instructor about how to proceed. There is an art to taking notes for research; careless note-taking can lead to plagiarism."
1958-59 Membership of the Committee on Academic Misconduct

EDGAR C. CLARK, Chairman
ALBERT J. KOHN
CHARLES C. CALLAHAN
Member ex-officio:
WILLIAM S. GUTHRIE

Present in committee hearings are the student alleged to be guilty of misconduct, his instructor (or a representative from his department), the three faculty members (one of whom serves as chairman), the Executive Dean, the Dean of Men or the Dean of Women, the academic Dean's representative (of the student's college who serves for all cases from his college), a staff member of the University Counseling and Testing Center, and a representative from the Student Senate. The Deans and the college representative bring to the meeting all records, academic and disciplinary, concerning the accused student.

The Dean of Men or the Dean of Women, the academic Dean's representative, or the counselor from the University Counseling and Testing Center may be sought out by the student in advance of the meeting since they are not voting members of the committee. They are observers and participants in the discussion, however. A student who so chooses may consider any one of them as his counselor and representative for the occasion of the hearing.
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Honesty Committee to Seek Remedy

Poll Bares Cheating at OSU

A student poll shows classroom cheating at Ohio State University is so widespread that 79 per cent of students who answered the poll, said they've witnessed it.

Forty-two per cent admit they have cheated.

The Women's Self Government Association (WSGA), the largest women's group at OSU, asked for and got Wednesday a pledge of action on its poll's findings.

THE WSGA SENT questionnaires to 6000 students and 2000 faculty members. More than 1800 students and 452 professors responded.

To the question, have you ever seen any cheating in your classes, 79 per cent of the students and 52 per cent of the faculty said yes.

But 88 per cent of the answering students said no to the question, "Was anything done about the cheating?"

The Faculty came up with various replies - students, lowering grades and referring the case to the Committee on Academic Dishonor. The professors who moved students claim the cheating occurred mainly in first year courses.

Result of the poll, which ended last May, "indicates evidence of academic misconduct on this campus," said the WSGA.

The Women's group asked the university's highest student-faculty-administration board, the Council on Student Affairs (CSA), to do something about the cheating.

The CSA voted unanimously Wednesday night to set up a committee.

The committee will "deal with the entire problem of academic honesty in
The Council on Student Affairs last night authorized creation of a committee of student, faculty and administration leaders to promote "academic honesty" at Ohio State.

The action is a result of a report by the Women's Self Government Association on a survey made last year to determine the extent of cheating in Ohio State classrooms.

According to the WSGA report, the survey "indicates evidence of academic misconduct on this campus" and WSGA feels preventive measures should be taken.

Six Students
The Council on Student Affairs, after hearing the report, unanimously voted to "establish a committee from a wide cross section of student, faculty and administration to deal with and discuss the promotion of academic honesty in practical, effective ways at Ohio State."

CSA appointed its six student members to the new committee to represent the student body. They are Kathryn McDaniel, A-3; H. Paul Schvitzgel, Comm-4; Carol L. Davis, Ed-4; Philip W. Warken, grad; Daniel J. Swilling, A-4; and Ann E. Yarrington, H-Ec-4.

The rest of the committee will be made up of three administrators and three out of 48 faculty members who indicated willingness to serve in their responses to WSGA questionnaires.

8,000 Questionnaires
WSGA reports one kind of questionnaire was sent to 6,000 students in residence units and a different kind to 2,000 faculty members. More than 1,800 student and 452 faculty questionnaires were returned.

Compilation of questionnaires yielded the following statistics, among others:
Seventy-nine per cent of the students and 52 per cent of the faculty answered "yes" to the question: Have you ever seen any cheating in your classes?
Eighty-eight per cent of the students answered "no" to: "Was anything done about the cheating?"
Preventive Measure Needed
Forty-two per cent of the students answered "yes" to: Have you ever cheated?

Students indicated most of the cheating occurred in 400 level courses.

In its report to CSA, WSGA notes, "We realize that the validity of these questionnaires is limited as a true measure of the extent of the problem, but they do give solid proof of a problem."

Ten or 12 faculty members returned notes praising our efforts and no one objected to the idea of action on this problem, according to WSGA.

WSGA says the survey "puts forth the problem in a positive manner—the promotion of academic honesty", and that it calls for "preventive" and not "punitive" measures.
Implicated Students Discuss Cheating

By Ned Artman 7-15-66
Lantern Staff Writer

Five of the students involved in the cheating scandal at Ohio State this week were having dinner together Monday night, the day before the University revealed their punishments.

The conversation was centered around the cheating and what would happen to them.

I was acquainted with one of the five and he had invited me to join them.

Studying When Called

"We were studying 'legally' at my apartment when a friend of mine called and asked if we wanted to buy a copy of the Math 417 final for $150," one of them said. "We managed to talk the seller down to $100 and got six other guys to chip in some money so we wouldn't have to pay so much individually."

One of the accused cheaters continued the story:

"We were pretty upset when we took the final and discovered many of the problems had been changed. They had made subtle changes like substituting a plus for a minus sign or changing one digit of a large number."

Money Wasted

"I felt like I had thrown my money away," another said "I had to work out the whole test and might as well have not even had the exam copy."

"Some of the kids didn't even see the changes," one of the five said. "They wrote down the answers they had memorized the night before without reading the test."

The students talked to felt that those who answered the test from memory were caught first and then implicated the students who saw the changes.

Sellers Not Enrolled

"The five students that originally took the test from the math building will be the ones that get expelled," another student said. "They weren't even taking the course. They stole the test to make money by selling it."

"What did your parents say when you told them you got caught cheating?" I asked.

"Mine kicked me out of the house and told me that they weren't going to finance any more of my college education even if I didn't get expelled," one of them said.

"I haven't worked up the nerve to tell mine yet," another said, "but I guess I'll have to if I get thrown out."

Another of the five said: "I went to see my college counselor this morning and he said, 'Don't worry about getting expelled. If you do, it's not going to be the end of the world.'"

I've got news for him. If I get thrown out, I'll probably get drafted and if I get drafted, I'll get sent to Vietnam. Once I get to Vietnam, I'll get my head blown off and if that's not the end of the world, I don't know what is." All of them seemed to fear the idea of being drafted and sent to Vietnam if they were expelled.

"I really don't think we will be kicked out of school," one of them said, "because there are too many of us involved. The University doesn't want the scandal."

Not Really Cheating

Another commented that if he got expelled, he was going to get a lawyer and sue to get back in.

"They will be stepping out of their legal bounds if they throw us out because we really didn't have the final. The math department changed the final so we didn't get the chance to use the one we bought."

"What we did was really no different than using a fraternity or sorority test file," he added.

Sends Letter

One of the students showed me a copy of a letter he had written to Bonner.

The letter said that he had been very worried about passing the course and when he saw the opportunity to purchase the final, he had to do it. He said he was afraid he would flunk out of school if he didn't get a passing mark in mathematics. He concluded his letter by saying he was very sorry about the situation and admitted his part in the cheating.

"I know I didn't accomplish much by sending it, but it sure didn't hurt anything," the letter writer said.

"No one group was involved more than another," one said. The others agreed. "There were some independents, some Greeks and a few athletes."
Three Ohio State Officials Say Cheating Is Isolated

By JOSEPH D. KEEFER
Lantern Staff Writer

An administration official and two faculty members believe the mathematics cheating scandal was only an isolated incident and does not indicate a serious problem of widespread cheating here.

John T. Bonner Jr., executive dean for student relations, said only a small minority of Ohio State students is guilty of cheating and that students tend to exaggerate the amount of cheating that goes on.

Dr. Arnold E. Ross, chairman of the mathematics department, said: "We feel rather safe that cheating was comparatively rare, and I still think this is true," he said.

Dr. William J. Tynick, professor of animal science and chairman of the Committee on Academic Misconduct, said he does not think student dishonesty is increasing. He said he feared cheating scandals reflect badly on other students.

The Committee on Academic Misconduct took disciplinary action after hearings Monday.

Bonner said: "This university does not condone cheating and it hopes this incident will be an object lesson."

Three years ago, the Women's Self-Government Association said in a report on academic honesty that 42 percent of the students surveyed admitted cheating in college courses.

He said Ohio State usually doesn't publicize minor cheating cases but that the "magnitude" of this case required different treatment.

Bonner said he hopes the incident will alert all campus departments to be more careful in testing security procedures.

Ross said the math department hopes to strengthen test security without overemphasizing it and creating "mutual suspicion and mistrust."

Ten of the students involved in the scandal were dismissed from the university and the 29 others received penalties of varying severity. The students are all men, Bonner said.

The committee suspended 16 students for six months, two for nine months, "tagged" the college records of five students who were unable to attend the hearings, put three on recorded probation and one on unrecorded probation. Everyone involved received a failure in the course. Two of the students received no other penalty except the failure.

The students dismissed can apply for readmission to Ohio State after a "A couple" of the students had averages above 3.0, Bonner said. One student had an average in the 90's in the math course but wanted the test for insurance, he added.

All but eight of the 39 students were freshmen, Bonner said.

Bonner said the 10 students dismissed in this case is greater than the number usually dismissed in a year for all types of student misconduct. The total of 39 cases is more than the committee normally hears in two years, he said.

The departmental exam involved was a three-page series of problems to be given to 700 students, Ross said.

Bonner said the students told the committee a custodian was paid $100 to unlock the cabinet. The custodian, since dismissed, said he was paid only $43.

The theft occurred June 8, the night before the exam was scheduled.

The students duplicated and sold the exam, Bonner said. They received from $4 to $50 and asked as high as $150, he said. It was estimated that $300 to $400 changed hands.

Before the test was given, a student not involved in the scandal reported the theft and sales. Changes were then made in the test to catch the cheaters but it is not likely these students would be readmitted, Bonner said.

Officials "tag a student's record by attaching a note to the record stating the student cannot be readmitted until he appears before the committee."

Students on recorded probation had their record marked while the students on unrecorded probation merely got a letter of warning from the Office of the Dean of Men, Bonner added.

Only two or three of the students were not enrolled in the math class, Tynick said. The originator of the plot was not in the class, he said.

Six of the 39 students had been dismissed after Spring Quarter for failure to meet academic standards, Bonner said. Another 19 students had less than a 2.0, the minimum for graduation, he said.
Students To Appeal Punishment, Claim Hasty Act, Prejudgment

Several of the 39 students involved in Ohio State University's recent "cheating scandal" hope to appeal their punishments—but they don't know to whom to appeal.

OSU officials were a bit uncertain about this Friday, too.

IN A SERIES of interviews with the Citizen-Journal, several students indicated they felt they were dealt with too quickly and too harshly.

The families of four of the boys have contacted the office of John T. Bonner, dean of student relations. Bonner told them they would have to channel their appeal through him—after he returns from his vacation in mid-August.

OSU's "STUDENT Handbook of Rules and Information" states, however, that appeals of decisions of this nature must be made through President Novice G. Fawcett.

Fawcett, too, is on vacation, and won't return for two weeks.

About the hasty interviews with the Committee for Academic Misconduct, one student said, "My hearing took about three minutes. No more than four."

ANOTHER SAID his hearing lasted only 12 minutes. Both were dismissed from the university.

Several complained of loaded questions and of being prejudged before being heard.

One student said committee members had many pages of information before them during interviews and asked only brief questions.

What kind of students were those accused of misconduct?

THE ONES INVOLVED in actually bribing the building custodian were not even enrolled in the mathematics course in question.

Some said they didn't know why they did it. Others admitted it was because of the money.

One said he did it because the others were his friends.

"I was just a guy that had a car," he said. "I didn't know where they were going."

ONE STUDENT admitted selling the test to another for $25. "He was practically in tears about flunking the course," the boy said. "So I sold it to him."

Students involved were not allowed to take anyone with them during their hearings.

"THEY TOLD ME I would get off easier if I told the truth," one said. "I told the truth and was dismissed. I'm glad I didn't lie."

Bonner has said they could apply for readmission to OSU but probably would not be accepted there.

ONE MOTHER SAID, "What is there to say. It's over. It isn't the end of the world. My boy will go on. We hope he can get back in some school."

Another distraught mother asked "Is it fair for a boy to have his whole life ruined like this for his first mistake?"

SEVERAL OF THE students said they cheated for the obvious reason—to get a better grade.

One was in danger of flunking. He bought a copy of the test but noticed the changes made by math department personnel and answered the questions on the changed test.

"I still passed the course," he said. "I got a D in the course—until I was called in later for a hearing. Then I received a failing grade."

ANOTHER NOTICED the changes also. He received an A in the course, he said—until summoned. He said he didn't really need the test, because he had a 97 average going into the final. He just took it for "insurance."

These students don't feel they should have been harshly punished because they claim they didn't actually cheat.
Pressure, Fear Cause Cheating

By JOSEPH D. KEEFER
Lantern Staff Writer

Cheating in college is an unfortunate by-product of mass education which can only be controlled by the students themselves. This was the consensus of six Ohio State faculty and administration personnel who discussed the problem this week.

The question of college cheating was revived here last week when University took disciplinary action against 39 students in what officials called the worst cheating scandal in Ohio State's history.

Students To Appeal

Cyrus H. Sedgwick, administrative assistant in the Office of Student Relations, said it appears several of the students will appeal their dismissals, although only one student so far has told the office he plans to appeal.

The six faculty and administration personnel interviewed concurred that the mounting emphasis being placed on college education is basically responsible for student dishonesty. Fear of not making high grades or fear of flunking out of school cause students to cheat, they agreed.

They said the importance of college education is stressed to a point that students who don't succeed in college are regarded as socially unacceptable and intellectually deficient.

Not Cut Out For College

Merwin E. Potter, assistant dean and director of counseling for the office of Commerce and Administration, said: "Everybody is just not cut out for college."

John T. Bonner, executive dean for student relations, said: "College is not the only way to get an education, but it's the best way."

Frances E. Naylor, senior counselor for the College of Arts and Sciences, said: "College puts too much emphasis on grades but we don't know how to do otherwise."

Donald L. Mosher, assistant professor of psychology, said he thinks overemphasis on college education has caused some students to "lose sight" of education as an end in itself and not solely as a means to her end.

He said students are more likely to cheat if they regard college merely as "a ticket to a job" instead of an opportunity "to gain appreciation for life" and "to understand man."

Cheating Not New

Alfred C. Clarke, associate professor of sociology and anthropology, said cheating in college "is not a particularly new phenomenon. It is not surprising that some persons will take the risk."

Clarke said: "Society is requiring increasing levels of performance" and this puts pressure on students.

Most of those interviewed agreed that parents play a major role in exerting pressure on students.

Mary Alice Price, associate director of the University Counseling center, said it is hard to pinpoint reasons for cheating because people simply are different. She said nearly all of the 39 students disciplined last week gave different reasons why they cheated.

Miss Price said college students' attitudes toward cheating are often determined by high school experience. A student is more likely to cheat in college if cheating was acceptable in his high school, she said.

Those interviewed agreed that nearly all college students are under some sort of pressure and that the students' moral values are the ultimate criteria for judgment.

Miss Naylor said the "moral issue" should be emphasized in probing the reasons why students cheat.

"Students look at the materialistic side of things too much," she said. "They feel easier to follow others than to make decisions themselves."

Potter said cheaters "just lack the intestinal fortitude to face up to the issues."

OSU Cheats Cases To Be Appealed

The cases of three students allegedly involved in an Ohio State University cheating incident in June will be appealed to Student Relations Dean John T. Bonner. "In the next few weeks, Bonner said Friday."

DISCIPLINARY action was taken against the three by OSU's Faculty Committee on Academic Misconduct, involving theft and sale of a freshman mathematics final examination.

Bonner reported that "it's beginning to look as if we won't get the number of appeals we expected, but I'm sure eventually it will be more than three." Committee action was taken against 39 students, ranging from dismissal to failing grades.

THE APPEALS WILL be heard by Bonner, who has executive authority to waive the penalties. Bonner reports he made no recommendations to the faculty committee on the original case and had no vote in their decision.

Students Appeal Refused at OSU

Four of five Ohio State University students who appealed their punishment as a result of a recent cheating scandal, have been officially turned down by John T. Bonner Jr., executive dean for student relations.

The other case is still being considered on a technicality in the wording of the punishment but the appeals in no way affected the length of time they will be out of the university, Bonner said.

The students offered no mitigating circumstances to explain their theft and sale of a mathematics exam. Bonner said.
Dean Upholds Committee In Cheating Punishments

Six of the 39 students punished for taking part in last spring's cheating incident have appealed their cases to John T. Bonner Jr., executive dean for student relations.

In all six cases the punishments of the Committee on Academic Misconduct were sustained.

39 Admitted Access

The 39 punished last spring had all admitted having access to the final examination for Mathematics 417 spring quarter.

At that time five students pooled their funds and bribed a janitor to unlock the cabinet containing the tests. The others involved had purchased and passed along copies of the stolen exam.

Bonner Informed

A student informed Bonner of the stolen exam traffic, and the mathematics department was alerted. Subtle changes were made in the exam questions to trap cheaters who merely wrote down memorized answers.

Eventually all 39 admitted parts in the incident, and were tried and punished by the Committee on Academic Misconduct. Ten were dismissed, 18 were suspended and 11 were placed on various types of recorded and unrecorded probation.

Six appealed to Bonner this summer to lessen their punishments. All six were denied.

"I can only overrule the Committee when I am shown new evidence, a mitigating circumstance or faulty procedure by the Committee," Bonner said. "None of the appeals claimed any of these factors, so they could not be allowed."

Appeals Listed

Five of the appeals were from students dismissed or suspended from the University, but one was from a student placed only on recorded probation.

Bonner said that there are two other academic misconduct cases scheduled for hearing this month, but both involve only one person.

He said that his office sees only about 36 students per year in all academic misconduct cases, including cheating. The 39 student incident last spring was the largest in the University's history, he said.

Three Cheaters To Appeal Case

At least three of the 39 students disciplined in the Spring Quarter mathematics cheating scandal will appeal their cases next week to John T. Bonner Jr., executive dean for student relations, Bonner said yesterday.

Bonner said all of the students disciplined admitted involvement in the cheating scandal.

One or two other students may also appeal, Bonner said.

Bonner said that he, instead of President Novice G. Fawcett, will make the final decision on the appeals. The president delegated his authority to Bonner, the dean said.

Ten students were dismissed from the University July 11 and 29 others received penalties of varying severity in action by the misconduct committee.

The students were penalized for involvement in the theft and sale of a final examination in mathematics Spring Quarter.

The appeals were delayed since Bonner has been on vacation for the past three weeks.
Dean Disclaims Student Charges

Charles R. Gambs, Jr., associate dean for student relations, denied charges made by the judicial subcommittee of the Constitutional Convention that the administration handles student misconduct cases unfairly.

He referred to Sondra K. Gorby's statement that administrative hearings are “trials without total due process of the law because student defendants do not have the right to counsel.” Miss Gorby is a Constitutional Convention delegate.

“Confusion arises from equating the proceedings of a criminal court with the proceedings of a university disciplinary commission,” Gambs said.

He said due process of the law required by the United States Constitution only applies to criminal courts of law.

‘Proceedings Not Trials’

Gambs said that administrative disciplinary proceedings are not trials. “No attempt is made to parallel university disciplinary proceedings with criminal trials. Such university proceedings are hearings.”

Gambs said the rule that gives the dean of men and the dean of women the prerogative to determine which discipline cases shall be referred to the student courts is fair.

‘Fair Method’

“If the alleged misconduct is of the type that would result in a mark on the student’s permanent record, that is, a recorded probation, suspension or dismissal, the case is referred to the student’s college disciplinary commission,” he said.

“This is a fair and equitable means of dealing with the problem. A student’s college office knows more about him than anyone else at the University.”

Deans’ Decisions

“Student members serve on most of these college commissions, so the views of students is heard.”

Gambs said the dean of men and the dean of women are justified in deciding whether they will handle cases involving unrecorded probations or refer them to the Student Judicial Board.

“They are carrying out a duty delegated to them by the Board of Trustees,” he said. “For our campus this system is effective.”

Bonner Decides

“Neither the deans nor the college commissions hand judgments down to students. They make recommendations to John Bonner Jr., executive dean for student relations.

“It is up to Bonner to approve or disapprove these recommendations,” Gambs said.

“The student rulebook is available to the student. It is up to him to read it and be aware of his rights,” Gambs said.

Gambs said the present judicial system is fair and efficient. “I would not rule out the possibility of change in the future, however,” he said.

Senate Resolution Raps Faculty Rule

By CATHARINE SMITH
Lantern Staff Writer

Student Senate last night adopted a resolution which opposes the faculty rule on academic misconduct, and discussed a resolution to abolish student dress regulations.

The first resolution urges the Council on Student Affairs to seek the removal or amendment of a faculty rule on academic misconduct under which students are presumed guilty until they prove their innocence.

The other resolution would prohibit the regulating of student dress in any way by any student governing body.

Under the current faculty rules on academic misconduct, (D-1, Section 3), a student suspected of cheating on an exam “shall be presumed to have been guilty of academic misconduct. The burden shall then be on the student to convince the committee that he was not, in fact, guilty of academic misconduct.”

In introducing the resolution Mark R. Solomon, educational affairs commissioner, said the current rule is directly contrary to the American way of doing things.

“It’s almost inconceivable to me that the university has such a rule,” Solomon said.

There was some debate on the resolution. George Pattison, Dist. 7, said it would not change anything and Senate should instead concern itself with making sure anyone accused of misconduct is allowed to face his accuser. The resolution passed.

The resolution on dress regulations, introduced by Philip H. Kalban, Dist. 17, reads:

“Be it resolved that any and all student governing organizations be prohibited from regulating in any way the dress or appearance of those it governs.”

Action may be taken on this resolution next week, Tim Neustadt, student body president, said. After he meeting Neustadt said he hoped the resolution would provide a test case to see if Senate or some of the other governing bodies on campus have final jurisdiction over such matters.

Neustadt said he believes Senate should have final jurisdiction if it is to be an effective governing body.
Scales Are Tipped Against the Accused

(Student Senate took the first step last night in passing a resolution to change Section 3. See story on Page 1.)

28 Oct 66

There are two judicial systems at Ohio State and two kinds of justice.

There is a very good student judicial system that handles cases involving traffic violations very fairly.

The other judicial system is run by the administration. It handles cases involving academic misconduct and major university violations very unfairly. But we now have reason to hope for a change.

The judicial system run by students is called the Student Judicial Board. A Student Court of seven student justices has final jurisdiction over student cases.

The Student Court defines justice as Americans have come to understand it. Defendants are guaranteed due process of law. They have the right to counsel. They are presumed innocent until proved guilty. They have the right to appeal, and that appeal is heard by the seven justices.

The judicial system run by the administration doesn’t have a name and it doesn’t have much justice either.

It is made up of the dean of men, the dean of women, the college disciplinary commission and the executive dean of student relations.

Defendants are denied due process of the law. They have no right to counsel. They are presumed guilty until proved innocent. Section 3 of the rules of the Committee of Academic Misconduct states:

"If, during an examination, a student communicates with another student or has in his possession a crib, he shall be presumed to have been guilty of academic misconduct. The burden shall then be on the student to convince the committee that he was not guilty."

Defendants can make only one appeal to only one man, John T. Bonner, Jr., executive dean for student relations.

However, Bonner, when questioned recently by Student Body President Tim Neustadt about the “presumed guilty” section, said the section is “contrary to every principle of Anglo-Saxon law we know of” and that it was likely a recommendation to change the section would soon be presented to the Faculty Council.

But, with Bonner’s support of a change to a more equitable Section 3, we are given the hope that other aspects of administrative “justice” will be brought up to the same levels of integrity which the University expects of its students.
Committee Alters Misconduct Rules

31 Oct 66
By SUSAN STINE
Lantern Staff Writer

Students called before the Committee on Academic Misconduct may now bring witnesses to the hearing and "may bring a tenured member of the faculty to act as counsel," said Dean John T. Bonner, Jr., Friday.

Bonner, dean for student relations, is an ex-officio member of the committee.

Besides this and several other procedural changes the committee proposed Wednesday that the "presumed to be guilty" section of Faculty Rule 29.2721 be stricken.

The rule states: "If, during the course of an examination, a student communicates with another student or has in his possession a crib or other improper examination aid, he shall be presumed to have been guilty of academic misconduct. The burden shall then be on the student to convince the committee that he was not, in fact guilty of academic misconduct."

Bonner said that this section is "contrary to every principle of Anglo-Saxon law we know of."

Previously the committee rule (under Procedure in Committee Hearings in the Student Handbook) read: "As the student's interests are adequately represented, he is not permitted to bring an outside observer of his own choice."

"We've always had this (allowing witnesses)," he said. "We just never spelled it out in writing before."

Bonner added that witnesses allowed would not be character witnesses, but witnesses "who contribute to establishing the student's innocence."

The decision of guilt and the appropriate penalty will be made from now on by the three faculty and one student members of the committee without the vote of Bonner. Previously Bonner participated in the decision of guilt, accepted or rejected the committee's recommendation for penalty, then heard any appeal to the case.

"That situation was incongruous," Bonner said. "I shouldn't be making the decision and hearing appeals at the same time."

Bonner added that although the Student Handbook states that only three faculty members and he decide the case, "the student member has been participating in the decision since he joined the committee four years ago." He said the wording of the rule is out of date and should be changed.

The committee will no longer check the files of the dean of men or women for previous disciplinary action against the student before deciding his guilt.

"The student's previous record shall have no effect on the decision," Bonner explained. "It should be decided strictly from the facts of the case."

The student's letter of notification, which until now only defined the charge, will contain a copy of the instructor's letter accusing him of the alleged offense.

The student will now be asked to submit a written statement before the hearing, instead of bringing it with him when he appears.

"This will give the committee time to become familiar with it ahead of time," Bonner said. Bonner added that three days should be time enough to duplicate and distribute the statement.

The committee proposed that parts of sections 1 and 2 of Faculty Rule 29.2721 be altered to the effect that Bonner should have no vote on the committee and that the committee decide the student's case rather than make recommendations to Bonner.

Bonner said the proposals would be presented to the Faculty Council Nov. 8.
Rule Changes Bring Equality, Grigsby Says

2 Nov 66
By SUSAN STINE
Lantern Staff Writer

Recent changes and proposals made by the Committee on Academic Misconduct are designed to make the student a first-class citizen again, according to Assoc. Prof. Gordon Grigsby, member of the committee. "In no other place in the country is a person assumed guilty until proven innocent," he said.

"A student shouldn't have to give up his civil rights just because he is a student. Changing this rule makes him equal to other citizens."

Grigsby was referring to the committee's proposal, made last Wednesday, that the "presumed guilty" section of Faculty Rule 29.2721 be scratched from the books.

Section Noted
The section reads: "If, during the course of an examination, a student communicates with another student or has in his possession a crib or of improper examination aid, he shall be presumed to have been guilty of academic misconduct. The burden shall then be on the student to convince the committee that he was not, in fact, guilty of academic misconduct."

"The student may deny cheating and say he was communicating about something else," Grigsby said. "Unless he is warned sufficiently ahead of time, he could make this mistake. It will no longer be a question of his word against the instructor's. The instructor making the charge must have more evidence."

He added, that in practice, the committee already follows the principle of innocent until proved guilty.

'A Step Forward''
Prof. William Heintz, chairman of the committee, said the proposal represented a step forward in faculty attitude. "The committee doesn't take the attitude of the people who put the rule on paper in the first place," he said.

Other Change
Besides this proposal, the committee proposed that parts of sections 1 and 2 of Faculty Rule 29.2721 be altered to the effect that Bonner should have no vote on the committee and that the committee decide the student's case rather than make recommendations to Bonner. These will be presented to the Faculty Council Tuesday.

The proposals were made as the result of several major changes in the committee's own rules. A student called before the committee will now be permitted to bring outside witnesses and a tenured faculty member to act as his counsel. The student's records will no longer be considered until after the decision of guilt is made. Bonner will no longer have a vote in the decision of guilt of the student nor will he decide on the penalty.

Bonner Withdraw
"Bonner withdrew his vote—we didn't have to fight for it," Grigsby said. "The revision gives the authority to the faculty to decide educational policy and discipline."

In these matters, he said, "it is appropriate for faculty rather than administration to be in authority."

Bonner said he thought his position "incongruous." He said he "shouldn't be making the decision, and hearing the appeals at the same time."

Heintz said that Bonner has not voted on a case in the three years he (Heintz) has been on the committee. "The reason for this is that he has facts about the student that we don't—facts that could affect his decision."

The dean of men, dean of women, a representative of the student college, and the director of the Counseling Center are present at the committee's hearings.

"They are there to counsel the student," Heintz said. "But they don't participate in our deliberation, and we don't ask them any questions about the student's past." If the student is found guilty, only then does the committee check his records and consult his deans before deciding on a penalty.

Chairman Pleased
Sondra Gorb, chairman of the judicial committee of the Constitutional Convention, said she was "very pleased" with the committee's changes. She previously called the committee's hearings "trials without due process of law."

She questioned paragraph "I" under Procedure in Committee Hearings in the Student Handbook, which states that only the "three faculty members and the Executive Dean" make the decision and determine the appropriate action to be taken.

Heintz said that the student member of the committee votes and has done so since he joined the committee four years ago.

Rule Overlooked
"The rule has been overlooked," he said. "It's not unusual for practice to get ahead of written rules. I agree with Miss Gorb that it should be changed."

Kathleen Vanausdoll, the current student member of the committee, said that she does vote.

She added that "There is a tendency for students to think the committee is out to get them. These rule changes will clarify our procedures and may soothe their complaints about justice on the campus."

G. Robert Holsinger, executive assistant to the President and secretary of the Faculty Council, said he doesn't expect opposition to the proposals by the council.
Faculty Requests
Guilt Rule Change

Faculty Council yesterday approved recommendations to drop the "presumed guilty" rule from the University regulations.

The controversial rule states that if a student is found with a crib sheet in his possession, or observed communicating with another student, that he will be presumed to be guilty of cheating unless he can show proof otherwise.

Bonner called the rule "in direct opposition to every principle of Anglo-Saxon law."

Bonner also asked that the rules for the committee be changed to make him a non-voting member. He had been a voting member, though he said that he never used his vote.

"It was in the untenable position of voting on the innocence or guilt of a student, then accepting that decision as dean of student relations and then possibly hearing appeals of that decision," he said.

A decision was made to form a committee to investigate the revision of the Council on Research, to be chaired by Prof. Phillip Jastram.
DISCIPLINARY DISPOSITION AND AJUDICATION

The President of the University administered discipline and judged alleged "misconduct" through about the first fifty years of the University's operation, the President's Annual Reports indicate. With the establishment of the offices of the Dean of Women and Dean of Men, either the Deans themselves or members of their staffs were responsible for discipline and student behavior. In both offices, in the later years, the Assistant Dean who normally had responsibility for a certain area (e.g., rooming house, fraternity, etc.) processed such problems in his respective domain. The procedure followed would usually include these steps: A) the personnel staff member would be informed of a behavior problem or rule infraction, and B) determine if the report had substance or merited inquiry. If so, C) the staff member would investigate and provide a full report plus recommendation for action to his Dean. The Dean would recommend action to the President or, after 1945, to the Vice President or Executive Dean. Penalties for established guilt ranged from unrecorded probation, recorded probation, suspension, or dismissal. In 1968, "unrecorded probation" was changed to "disciplinary probation to the Office of the Dean of Students," to signify the action being on record, but not on one's transcript or other permanent record as would be the case in "Recorded Probation."

In 1958, Executive Dean Guthrie hired Mr. Charles R. Gambs, Jr., an attorney, as Assistant Dean, Offices of Deans, Men and Women. Mr. Gambs' role in disciplinary matters was to investigate alleged rule infractions and/or behavior problems and present a written summary of all pertinent information in the case to all parties involved. His report would go to either of the Deans who, usually with staff consultation, would recommend disciplinary action.

In 1964, the decision-making responsibility for recommendations of disciplinary action was transferred from the Dean of Men, Dean of Women's offices to College Discipline Committees established in each college.

Mr. Gambs continued to investigate reports alleging student conduct in violation of University rules; and in those cases where investigators established serious misconduct, the matter was referred to the College Discipline Committee of the college in which the student was enrolled for disciplinary hearing and recommendation. Dean Bonner decided to implement this decentralization because he felt that since the college office made the decision to dismiss and admit on academic grounds, so should they on disciplinary cases also. In addition, the hearing before the Discipline Committee insured that the due-process rights of the accused student were more adequately observed.
In 1967, when the Dean of Women's and Dean of Men's offices were eliminated as a result of the retirement of the two Deans, Mr. Gambs' title was changed to Associate Dean, Student Relations--Discipline Coordination--to distinguish this office's function from other Student Relations' offices.

Beginning with the Fall Quarter, 1969, a University Judicial Panel was established that assumed the jurisdiction of the former College Discipline Committees. Investigation of reports of student misconduct are conducted by specially designated Assistant Deans in the Dean of Students office. This panel, which has University-wide disciplinary jurisdiction, has faculty and representation from each of the twenty-five colleges and independent schools. A standing committee composed of the chairman, one other faculty member, one student member, and the Dean of Students--without vote, plus a second segment composed of one faculty member and one student member representing the college or school in which the accused student is enrolled, hears the charge of misconduct and makes the recommendation of disciplinary action.

The above procedures apply to all rule infractions except academic misconduct and disruptions. A special Committee on Academic Misconduct holds hearings, makes inquiry, judges guilt, and recommends disposition. This Committee also is composed of faculty members, two students, and the Dean of Students.

Cases of student activity that violates the University Disruption Rule (Rules 51.03 and 51.05) are heard by a special University Committee on Discipline which is composed of faculty, administrators, and student representation.

As was noted, rule infractions, except those involving academic misconduct or disruption, could be referred to student tribunals--and usually were if they did not involve infractions for which dismissal, suspensions, or permanent notation on the student's record could result--or in cases where the alleged misconduct appear to involve violations of criminal codes. Dean Conaway added that it was always her policy not to refer women students to be judged by their peers if the alleged "misconduct" involved "morals or very personal matters where insuring the confidentiality of the case was imperative."

STUDENT TRIBUNALS

The first student Court was set up with the first Student Senate in 1927.
Previous to that, the Dean of Women recorded frequently that she sent numerous cases to the Women's Council (later Women's Self Government Association) judicial bodies.

Though there were minor changes over the years, the most substantial reorganization and development of Student Court and other student judiciary bodies came as the result of a student study suggested by then Assistant Dean of Men Mylin Ross. The judicial bodies that were formulated then are, in essence, the same as those used—with different labels and more refined processes—in 1970, as listed below.

In 1965, a Student Judicial System was formed in which a student board exercised supervision over student judicial bodies and supposedly provided the structure for constant study and constructive revision of the system.

However, the most extensive attempt to improve the judicial bodies was made in 1968-1969 when a committee including law students and faculty reviewed the system and published a handbook explaining the policies and procedures of it. Said its authors, "This Handbook is prepared to assure that student responsibility as so delegated is properly executed and to assure that the policies and procedures for the S.J.S. are understood and uniformly administered by and for all students."
Cheating low as students trusted in examinations

By Andre Douek

Most Autumn quarter final exams will be closely proctored, but not in the Department of Electrical Engineering. Students there are trusted not to cheat on their tests.

Their examinations are never supervised. Faculty members simply distribute the test and leave the room. As one student noted, "They trust us!"

Marlin O. Thurston, chairman of the department, said the system has been in operation since 1940 and for the most part "violations of the system are rare." He said the incident rate is one in every two or three years.

The system requires anyone taking electrical engineering courses to write "no aid given, received, or observed" and sign his name after it. In effect, it makes every student in the room a possible "tattletale" should he happen to spot someone violating the oath.

"The pledge obligates you to report anyone you've observed cheating on the test," Lawrence M. Pontious, a senior from Columbus, said. "So it actually controls class just as well as when the teacher watches, if not better."

The system is under the supervision of the Electrical Engineering Student Council. Thurston said a violator is brought before the council for a hearing. He is then asked his side of the story and then the council "passes judgment."

Richard M. Campbell, assistant professor of electrical engineering, recalled when a violator was caught cheating and was turned over to the student council. The council decided to increase his graduation requirement by 15 hours.
'Ringers' not rampant at OSL but this reporter has it easy

2-7-74 By David Fink

A large university offers its students many things. It affords them diversified activity. It affords them a wide choice of courses. It affords them the opportunity to cheat.

How easily can a student sit in for someone else at an exam?

Over the last two weeks, this reporter was able to take three exams in classes in which he was not registered. The exams were not taken for anyone else. They were taken solely to determine whether a "ringer" can obtain a copy of a test, complete it and hand it in without being recognized by either the teacher or the graduate assistant. If I had chosen to put a member of the class' name on the paper instead of my own, none of the teachers would have ever known.

A poll taken by the Lantern in the last week indicates between 3 per cent and 7 per cent (or roughly between 1, 400 and 3,200) students at Ohio State have, at some time during their four years in school, taken an exam for someone else.

This statistic is by no means evidence of rampant cheating in this vein. It is, however, proof that this type of cheating does go on.

Thumbprint or photo

A piece in the October 23, 1973 issue of the Chronicle of Higher Education outlined the problem, in regard to standardized admissions tests administered by Educational Testing Service, based in Princeton, New Jersey. ETS, which conducts the Law School Admission Test, the Medical College Admisison Test and the Graduate Record Exams, has deemed it necessary to either thumbprint those taking the test or compare identification photographs with those submitting an application in order to verify the identity of those taking these examinations.

"It's important that people know we're concerned about fraudulent practices," Peter Winograd of ETS said.

Some might argue that an examination at Ohio State is hardly an entrance exam for medical school. At the same time, though, it is looked upon, by the teacher administering it, as having some importance. However, there are relatively few precautions taken, either by the University or particular departments of faculty members, to prevent a ringer from taking an exam for someone else.

At Ohio State, as at many other large schools, classes of 200 to more than 500 make it impossible for some teachers to learn their students' names, let alone recognize their faces. Some professors and students become machines - one spitting out data, the other absorbing it. Come exam time, it is easy to substitute another machine that may have been better programmed to reproduce the data.

Most are senior

Of the people found to have taken an exam for someone else at Ohio State, most were seniors. Thirty-seven percent of the seniors polled had taken another student's exam as opposed to a finding of between 2 per cent and 3 per cent of all those freshmen, sophomores and juniors responding.

Interestingly, only one respondent of the total of 357 students polled admitted to having had an exam taken for him.

When asked to briefly outline these penalties, only a little more than one half were able to do so - 51 per cent were aware of the possible penalties, 49 per cent were not.

One woman, who admitted to having taken an exam for someone, said, 'I don't really concern myself with it but I would assume the penalty is expulsion.'

Sometimes. The range of possible sanctions for such academic misconduct, as the University terms it, according to the Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities, run from "dismissal from the University for no less than four full quarters following the effective date thereof," to "admonition," which is a written statement to the student informing him that his conduct is in violation of the code.

Stiff penalties

"Ringers" may also be subject to suspension, "for not more than three full quarters" or University "disciplinary probation," which is imposed for "a definite period of time" during which the student is not eligible to participate in intercollegiate events or any major extracurricular activities.

The fact is, that although the code, in its introduction, states that it "is made available to students at the beginning of each academic year" and is "available upon request from each college office and the Office of the Dean of Student," only one half of those surveyed were aware of the penalties. And the Code is the only vehicle that outlines the penalties for cheating. Why?

One answer comes from E. Garrison Walters, Special Assistant to the Provost and Coordinator of the Committee on Academic Misconduct, the administrative branch which deals with these matters. The committee, while worried about its lack of communication with the student body, will not release any statistics concerning the incidence of academic misconduct.

"If we published the official statistics," Walters said, "people would want to know the sanctions and then the kids would start to calculate the odds of success."

Walters said that there is no University policy, per se, toward this problem. He admitted that the best way to handle it would be "to keep people from trying."

That's not easy. Intracollege contacts about cheating are informal, at best. There is little discourse between the administration and the faculty on menas of prevention and, thus, the problem is left to each separate department.

Prevention ignored

The only formal communication between the committee and the faculty is a flyer entitled, "Rules and Procedures of the Committee on Academic Misconduct," which is distributed to teachers each quarter. It outlines...
the steps to be taken if a student is caught cheating but says nothing about prevention.

What do the departments do? Most do little, if anything. The Lantern contacted 23 departments last week. Sixteen had no formal policy for detecting ringers. The usual response was that "we haven't found this to be a problem" or "we leave this to the instructor" or "we tell our teaching assistants to get to know their students."

Of the remaining nine, the Colleges of Law, Medicine, Dentistry and Veterinary Medicine rely on the Honor System, by which students are obligated to disclose any irregularities to the faculty members. Only the Departments of Astronomy, Biology, Mathematics, Philosophy, and the School of Nursing have taken measures to curb this problem.

Biology stringent

The Biology department is stringent in its precautions. Roger Bernard reported that sections are limited to 35 students. A student must take each exam with his own section.

If he is not recognized by his instructor, he is asked to show his ID. In administering the exam, each student is handed his packet separately and each individually returns his completed exam to his instructor.

Chairman Arne Slettebak of the Astronomy department disclosed that all signatures on exams are compared with those submitted on information cards at the beginning of the quarter.

The Math Department, which admitted to seven cases of cheating last quarter, has, according to Bert Waits, directed its graduate assistants to get to know its students and has begun to seat discussion sections separately in large exam rooms so that ringers can be detected.

The School of Nursing, which conducts a great proportion of practical exams, checks IDs when written exams are given chairwoman Edna L. Fritz, said.

The Philosophy department, following the directive of Chairman Robert Turnbull, has found that it can avoid this problem by having students return exams to their own teaching assistants rather than simply piling them together with the papers of students in other discussion groups.

Getting away with this type of cheating seems to be no worse problem in classes where no precautions are taken. I took tests in each of the following departments: Anthropology, Classics and Political Science. None of these departments have outlined methods to keep this from happening.

Papers in a stack

The Anthro exam was held in Stillman Hall. It was a typical lecture course — by the teacher’s own admission, the size was approximately 200 students. People lined up along the sides of the room. When they reached the front, they picked up a copy of the exam and a test booklet and returned to their seats.

When they were done, they deposited their papers in a stack at the front of the room. There was no attempt to discern whether the student was a member of the class.

The Classics test was given under similar circumstances. Held in a large lecture room in the basement of Hitchcock Hall, the test was taken by about 150 students. Exams were handed out by the professor and piled in front of the room upon completion.

Again, no attempt was made to identify the test-taker. I just sat there for the hour and looked as if I were working. Then I handed in my paper and left.

The Political Science exam was just as easy. The class size was smaller — about 85, according to the teacher’s estimate — and was given in an “average size classroom on the third floor of McPherson Lab. The grad assistant in the class sat behind me much of the exam. Once again, no means of identification was used and I was not caught.

In speaking to the respective teachers after having taken each exam, some common attitudes toward the problem surfaced.

They felt that the academic atmosphere is based on the assumption that there is a “certain honest and personal involvement” on the parts of both the student and the professor. “It’s not honest or personal,” said one. “In fact, it’s highly insulting.”

“Not fair”

When asked if ringers were taking anything away from them of the students, he said that “sophomores who might have done ‘A’ work, when compared to ringers who’ve had more experience, don’t get the credit due them. It’s just not fair to anybody.” Another commented that “they’re not taking anything away from me but they’re taking away from the academic integrity of the university.”

The third professor, in replying to the question of whether the student having the exam taken for him was wasting the teacher’s time, said, “No, maybe the best use of my time would be to speak to that student. But still, this type of cheating cheapens the course, the grade and the reward system for those who don’t cheat.”

He added, “The attendance in my class is usually about two-thirds of the enrollment. Even if I were to become familiar with those people, the problem would still exist because on exam day, the other third show up. I’ve never seen them before.”

But probably the most important response was given by the second teacher. When asked if checking identification would eliminate the problem, he said, “I don’t want to check IDs and be a policeman and I don’t think the students want me to check their IDs.”

And here the problem rests. Perhaps as a result of the academic freedom hassles of the sixties, the administration leaves the classroom to the faculty. The faculty, seemingly, does little to control “ringers.” So, it seems, the taking of exams for others will continue until the powers-that-be decide it is a problem to be reckoned with.

Except that Section A of the Rules and Procedures of the Committee on Academic Misconduct clearly states that, “In addition to its concern with student conduct, it is the further duty of the Committee on Academic Misconduct to investigate all lax or irregular methods that are employed by the instructional staff while conducting examinations, and that might tend to promote academic misconduct on the part of the students.”
Don't sweat over mid-terms and finals!
Let Ringers Inc. take them for you!
Suspected student confronted with charges before hearing

By Athelia Knight

Before a hearing or case reaches the Committee on Academic Misconduct (COAM), there are certain procedures an instructor and a “suspected” student must follow.

“The instructor should confront the suspected student or students (preferably in private) with the charge and attempt to obtain a written statement from the student either denying or admitting guilt, prior to reporting the case to the chairman of the academic unit,” according to COAM procedures.

The instructor is supposed to make a written report to the chairman of his academic unit. The student’s written statement is included in the instructor’s report, as are relevant documents, such as the crib used in an exam, or the paper from which the material was copied.

All borrowed passages in plagiarized writings are marked off by the instructor in square brackets.

Pack marked ‘confidential’

The department chairman reviews the instructor’s report and transmits it to the COAM chairman. “If possible, the report should be hand-carried. If not, the envelopes should be marked confidential,” COAM rules state.

If the accused student admits his guilt, the instructor may recommend that a hearing be waived, “but the final decision is the perogative of COAM.”

The student may demand a hearing if he wishes.

When an instructor does recommend waiver of a hearing, “his report should indicate what loss of academic credit is involved.” COAM “recommends that instructors give such students a grade of ‘E’ for the entire course.”

A recommendation for waiver of a hearing is only considered in first offense cases, COAM Chairman Margaret Blickle said. In such cases COAM notifies the student his offense has been recorded in its files. He is told what disciplinary action has been taken and that any future offense involving academic misconduct will be cause for a hearing.

3 major sanctions

Beyond admonition, COAM coordinator Gary Walters said, there are three major sanctions: University disciplinary probation; suspension; or dismissal.
Committee's goal to protect standards

By Athelia Knight

All cases of academic misconduct are supposed to be reported to COAM with the exception of those in professional colleges with their own published honor codes (Law, Medicine, Dentistry, and Veterinary Medicine).

"COAM's main goal is to protect the academic standards of the university," committee Chairman Margaret Blickle said. "The faculty has an obligation to report all cases of academic misconduct to COAM."

"However, COAM cannot make the faculty report a case; it can only inform the faculty of its rules and procedures."

Duty, dishonesty

Failure of an instructor to report a case of dishonest academic practice to COAM constitutes a serious breach of duty for two reasons," the code states. "The student's right to due process is violated and the academic integrity of the University is threatened."

"Whether or not a case of academic misconduct is reported to COAM depends on how the individual teacher views this obligation," Donald W. Good, assistant vice provost for Arts and Science said.

"Teachers differ," he said. "One teacher may think the ruling is too harsh and may not report the incident to COAM, but handle it his own way; while another may report the student to COAM immediately."

COAM should convince the faculty that they should turn in academic misconduct, Frank Pegues, former COAM member, said.

Flyer outlines rules

The University teaching staff members receive a flyer each quarter from COAM outlining its rules and procedures.

Students are informed of COAM through the Code, through Survey 100 classes or by instructors.

The English 100 theme folders contain a statement on plagiarism and its penalties.

"I think this is the only statement of this nature in Ohio State University," Good said.

"Each department should have some type of calm, reasonable statement on cheating. The statement would probably differ with the nature of each department."
COAM members diverse

The Board of Trustees' approval of a proposal to double the number of members is expected, but at present seven members make up the Committee on Academic Misconduct — three faculty, two students, and two staff.

The faculty members are chairman, Margaret Blickle, Department of English; C. Benjamin Meleca, Program in Introductory Biology; and Russell Utgard, Department of Geology and Mineralogy.

One three-year faculty appointment is made annually by the president so that one member will retire each year. Blickle is in her third year; Meleca is in his second year, and Utgard in his first.

The student members, appointed by the president to one-year terms, are Margaret Palmer, a senior from Alliance; and William Farrington, a graduate student from Columbus.

The undergraduate member, who must be a junior or above, is appointed from a list of no less than four nominated by Undergraduate Student Government Student Assembly. The graduate student member is appointed from nominations presented by the Council of Graduate Students.

Alexander Smith, Office of Student Programs and Development and code administrator, and E. Garrison Walters, special assistant to the Provost and committee coordinator, assist COAM and are nonvoting members. The faculty members and student members are the five voting
Misconduct committee deals with ethics

By Athelio Knight

No gavel. No judge in black. No jury box. No swearings in of witnesses. And no or- neys. But, it's a hearing.


In this soundproof, 20-by-18- foot room, your academic uire may be determined by 8 people sitting at the oden trapezoid-shaped table.

This is your hearing — or life before the Committee on academic Misconduct COAM and you sit at the art end of the trapezoid.

COAM handles all reported cases of academic misconduct. Their disciplinary actions range from admonition to dismissal.

A Lantern investigation into COAM has shown:

- A proposal to double the e of COAM because of its orkload has been approved by the University Senate.
- An instructor can be brought before COAM as well a student, although this rarely happens.
- COAM hearings and busi- ness meetings are not open to the public.
- COAM will not release figures on the number of ses and hearings it holds, which has enough cases to sp it meeting more than 3 a week.
- The records for academic misconduct are confidential and are kept "individually.

Three faculty members, one graduate student, and one degrade student make the voting membership of COAM. On Feb. 12 COAM pro- sed to University Senate it voting membership is to be increased to six faculty members, two graduate stu- dents, and two undergraduate students. COAM would continue to be assisted by a representative from the Office of Student Programs and Development (OSPD) and the committee coordinator from the Provost's office, who would have no vote.

Passed to trustees

University Senate approved the proposal April 9. The Board of Trustees must approve the proposal before it becomes effective, said E. Garrison Walters, COAM's chairman.

"COAM meets throughout the year," said Margaret Blickle, chairman. "We went all through last summer meeting because we had such a backlog.

The "Easy Writer" cases of two years ago (involving 82 students accused of buying term papers from a researcher and passing them in to instructors) were not finally handled until Winter Quarter of 1973, Walters said. "A couple of those cases are still pending because the students have not returned to the university.

"We could take care of the cases faster if the size of COAM was doubled," Blickle said. "We could meet more often.

"It's not quite fair to a student to be accused of plagia- rism or cheating in the spring, and then wait for the fall for a hearing," Blickle told the University Senate.

COAM is concerned that future delays might jeopardize due process.

At present, it's a COAM quorum is five persons with three of those five being voting members, one of whom has to be a student, Blickle said. A quorum is the minimum number of members that must be present for a hearing to be conducted.

Doubling the size of COAM would permit a quorum of seven with five of those seven voting, Walters said. Two of those five present must be student members.

"Lax or irregular" COAM is supposed to investigate all reported cases of "lax or irregular methods" used by instructors in administering exams and "that might tend to promote" student academic misconduct, the Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities states.

Blickle said that since she has been on COAM, she knew of no case against a teacher that had been brought to COAM's attention directly by a student. Since she had never heard of such a case, she said she was sure how it would be handled.

"There was a case where a group of students went to the chairman of the department and told him that there was cheating going on in a particular class," Blickle said. "The case was then turned over to COAM.

If a student wants to report a teacher for "lax or irregular methods," he should write to COAM describing the incident, Blickle said. "This is held strictly confidential."

The hearings and business meetings of COAM are not open to the public, Walters said.

COAM's file is just as confidential as its meetings. All documents related to each case are kept "individually" in this file in the Office of Academic Affairs, Walters said.

Purpose to protect

"Information in our file is only released to others with the student's written permission," Walters said. "COAM agreed recently that they will now require the student's signature to be notarized."

The purposes of the file are to keep a record of first offenses and to protect the student, Walters said.

"It helps the first time to tell the student that his offense is being recorded in a file and that the usual second offense sanction is dismissal," Walters said.

"In the future, if a person was charged with being involved in a previous case of academic misconduct and he was not involved, the absence of a record in our file would clear him," he added.

Look at own file

Students have the right to look at their own COAM files and to obtain copies of them, Walters said.

"If a college called and asked if we had an academic
misconduct file on a student, we wouldn’t tell them,” Walters said. “Even if the CIA or FBI came walking in here, I still would not release the student’s records without his written permission. I’m not familiar with the legal aspect, but I guess a court order would be needed to get a record without the student’s permission.”

But there is another set of files. OSPD keeps it.

These files record any final actions taken by COAM plus other “things brought to the attention” of the office about a student’s mental health and discipline, said Alexander Smith, custodian of the file. These files, too, can only be released with the permission of the student, Smith said.

Record filing varied

OSPD’s records are destroyed five years after the student’s graduation if a less severe University disciplinary action occurred such as academic probation, Smith said. If University actions such as suspension or dismissal occur, the file is kept “indefinitely.”
Teachers more attentive in seeking out cheaters

By James Hannah

Cheating on exams at Ohio State has always been a problem, but if the current workload of the Committee on Academic Misconduct is any indication, there has either been more cheating or better monitoring since 1974.

"It's really hard to tell if the actual number (of cheaters) has increased or whether faculty members are just more attentive," said Alexander F. Smith, coordinator of the office of judicial programs.

TEACHERS MAY be responding to pressure from the committee. In a March 13 letter to the faculty, the committee stressed that "it is the further duty of the Committee on Academic Misconduct to investigate all cases of lax or irregular methods that are employed by the instructional staff while conducting examinations, that might tend to promote academic misconduct..."

The letter defined academic misconduct as "cheating, plagiarism, substitution or some other dishonest practice."

In addition to the number of cases, Smith said penal-
OSU cheats researched

By Barrie Denmark
1-9-76

The Committee on Academic Misconduct is currently conducting research and compiling data from the past five years to determine how much cheating has increased.

Ohio State is typical of a national trend of increased cheating, said Leonard L. Haynes, assistant to the provost and coordinator for the Committee on Academic Misconduct.

A survey taken Autumn Quarter of Ohio State students seems to bear him out. In 50 interviews of undergraduate students early in November, 94 per cent, or 42 students, said they had cheated at least once during their college career. Of the eight who had not cheated, five were freshmen.

"If I cheat, it's not because I'd fail if I didn't, but to get a better grade," a nursing student who did not wish to be identified said. "Nearly all the girls do it at one time or another because the competition is so rough down here," she continued.

OTHER STUDENTS agreed that when they cheated it was for an A or a B in the course, not to pass an examination.

"In tough economic times, there is tremendous pressure on students to excel in grades," said David O. Frantz, associate professor of English.

Today students are acutely aware of increasing unemployment and they depend on good academic averages to get into graduate or professional schools, or to give them an edge on the job market, Frantz said.

The Department of Biological Sciences has combined prevention with convenience, according to Jeffrey A. Knight, a graduate teaching associate from Homewood, III.

In the lower level courses, where most reported cheating occurs, examinations are given to all sections at the same hour. "It saves us having to make up five or six different tests," Knight said.

ALSO, TESTS are proc-
Pre-med cheats overemphasizing grade pressures

1-9-76 By Robbie C. McGraw

A disappearing experiment setup, substitution of chemicals and contamination of chemical supplies are means of suspected cheating in pre-med required organic chemistry labs, said Robert H. Feiertag, lab supervisor of organic chemistry for the Department of Chemistry.

Some pre-med students view a grade under an 'A' in a required science course as a disaster.

Thomas L. Hamer, pre-medical advisor, said "But that's carrying it too far."

A student grapevine carries an erroneous rumor that a science course with a 'B' or 'C' will keep a student out of medical school, according to Dr. J. Hutchison Williams, co-chairman of the College of Medicine Admissions Committee.

Williams said he knew of no current pre-med student cheating incidents, but said, "human beings under stress can do things like this."

Feiertag said he receives one or two complaints per quarter from students about suspected lab cheating, but that cheaters are "hard to catch."

Feiertag said he received a complaint verified by the instructor that one student's entire experiment setup disappeared from the lab Autumn Quarter while the student stepped out for a few minutes.

The instructor said he saw a stranger whom he could not identify enter the lab while the student was out, and when the student returned, the entire setup was gone.

In one case Summer Quarter when cheating was suspected, Feiertag said faculty members contaminated one lab's supplies, and caught a student who used chemicals from outside the lab.

The case was sent to the Committee on Academic Misconduct. Coordinator for the committee and Assistant to the Provost, Leonard L. Haynes refused to release results of the case.

"One hard-science course with a weak performance is a dangerous indication and strong performance is a positive indication" of probable success in medical school, Williams said. "A bad performance in one area hurts but is not a cutoff. This kind of information is the most difficult thing to get across to students."

Hamer said he was not aware of any recent pre-medical student cheating, although he felt that "some" undetected cheating does occur.
Cheaters beware: ‘To err is human, but to forgive is not this University’s policy’

By Jody Steinberg

It seems valid to presume all students have contemplated cheating, at some point but acting on that impulse can be dangerous. The Committee on Academic Misconduct (COAM) adheres to the slogan "to err is human. to forgive is not University policy."

COAM deals with any cases of academic misconduct with examinations, plagiarism, and other forms of associated with academic work or grading, John Sena, chairman of COAM said.

"The committee looks at about 450-500 violations of the Code of Students’ Rights and Responsibilities in a year's time," Lex Smith coordinator of student services said.

In some cases a student may find out that he is in violation of the code, not through any deliberate act but because of ignorance, carelessness, or having allowed emotional impulses to outweigh rational judgment, Sena said.

"CHEATING IS one of the most common violations. Almost 90 cases of cheating were reported last year (1975-76) to COAM but more people cheat than ever get caught," Smith said.

"Cheating is a very serious problem and we are trying to deal with it in the best possible way," George P. Crepeau, assistant provost, said.

Many cases are never reported, and often students fail to bring an act of cheating to the attention of the instructor, he said.

"Occasionally a student who wants a good, clean education will report it," Crepeau added.

Some cases of cheating are not reported to COAM because an instructor chooses to have the case handled within the jurisdiction of his department. We encourage instructors to bring these cases to COAM, Crepeau said.

Robert E. Georges, dean of the College of Administrative Sciences said, "We put an emphasis on preventive action. We do nothing to erase temptation."

"IN A CASE of misconduct the instructor will talk to the student, then discuss it with the chairman and the dean, who decide if the case should go before COAM," George added.

Failure to report an act of misconduct to COAM, "may or may not be beneficial to the student. It's his education at stake — not only his grade," Crepeau said.

Plagiarism and cheating on examinations are the most common types of cheating of academic misconduct at Ohio State, Sena said, but bolder students have devised new methods such as obtaining change of grade slips and/or withdrawal forms and forging the signature of instructors, chairman and even deans.

Sena explained there have been cases in which students got withdrawal slips, forged official signatures and later claimed they withdrew from a course, when in reality they had failed. This discovery of forgery will result in immediate dismissal from the University, he added.

SENA CITED three causes for academic dishonesty:

- The overcommitment of time (taking more credit hours than one can handle).
- The stress placed on grades rather than learning.
- The fear of not being able to meet the competitive standards for admission into graduate and professional schools.

These reasons are considered trite and inexcusable by the committee. "COAM believes in accountability. People are responsible for their actions," Sena said.

"A number of cases brought before COAM involve above average, even excellent students who cheat in order to maintain an average sufficient for admission to graduate schools. Conduct rules are instituted by the committee according to the level of severity of the sanction. These range from dismissal, the most severe, to restitution. COAM aims to stop dishonestly before it occurs, not just mete out sanctions," Sena said.

COAM IS made up of six faculty members, two graduate students and two undergraduate students. "It meets once, often twice a week," Sena said.

"We have three active subcommittees conducting a comprehensive program of preventive measures," he said.
October 16, 1978

TO: University Teaching Staff
FROM: The Committee on Academic Misconduct
SUBJECT: Rules and Procedures of the Committee on Academic Misconduct

Once again we would like to call special attention to the problems and procedures of academic misconduct in the University. While the following text is abstracted from the Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities, we have tried to explain more fully how the Committee works in this important matter.

A. The Duties of the Instructional Staff

Dishonest academic practices are dealt with by the University in order to protect the academic standards of the University. In protecting these standards, the University recognizes its moral as well as its educational responsibility and authority. The obligations of the instructional staff in this context cannot be overstressed. First, if cases are not properly reported, the student's right to due process is violated, a circumstance which becomes especially serious if a sanction is applied. Second, the academic integrity of the University is threatened by the fact that, unless records of first offenses are properly kept, many students will not be sufficiently discouraged to prevent subsequent offenses.

In addition to its concern with student conduct, it is the further duty of the Committee on Academic Misconduct to investigate all cases of lax and/or irregular methods that are employed by the instructional staff while conducting examinations which promote academic misconduct on the part of students. The Committee recognizes that the physical facilities provided in which examinations are given are often less than ideal, but we maintain that even in a crowded classroom most potential misconduct can be prevented if proper precautions are taken. An examination should be properly proctored. In this regard, the Committee would be pleased to assist faculty in developing procedures which would serve to prevent misconduct.

There is general agreement among the Committee that where possible, "preventive medicine" should be practiced instead of post hoc treatment. It is our hope therefore that potential cases of Academic Misconduct can be avoided if the academic community assumes joint responsibility with the Committee for enlightening students on standards of integrity and academic behavior.
B. The Operation of the Rules

The following procedures apply to the disposition of cases involving academic misconduct (other than in professional colleges having their own published honor codes and procedures);

1.0 In every instance where academic misconduct is suspected, be it cheating, plagiarism, substitution or some other dishonest practice, the instructor should meet with the student or students involved and attempt to determine "what happened." (The presence of a colleague is strongly recommended when it appears that the evidence will substantiate a formal charge.)

In this meeting, every attempt should be made to preserve the traditional faculty/student relationship which is, after all, the foundation of the University. If the student readily and voluntarily admits to wrong doing, he or she should be asked to write a letter, to the faculty member, admitting guilt and furnishing such other information as the student may feel would be useful for a reviewing authority to know. If the student denies guilt, or does not know what action to take, no further attempt should be made to obtain a statement. In these cases, the student will be counseled by a representative of the Committee prior to further action.

2.0 The instructor shall describe the case fully in a written report to the chairman of his academic unit.

2.1 The report should be as complete as possible. The instructor should attach to his report all relevant documents, such as the crib used in an examination, or the paper of the student from whom the material was copied.

2.2 When a theme or report has been plagiarized, all borrowed passages should be set off in square brackets, and their location in the original source or a copy of it should be attached to the student's paper.

2.3 In cases of copying from another student during an exam, a copy of the exam should be included, as well as the answer sheets submitted by any students involved.

3.0 The department chairman shall conduct a full review of the alleged charge and then transmit the report to the Chairman of the Committee on Academic Misconduct, Office of Academic Affairs, 203 Administration Building if sufficient evidence exists to support a charge. If possible, the report should be hand-carried and marked "Confidential."
4.0 In all cases of misconduct, the instructor and department chairman may recommend a course of action (and, please, provide the rationale for such recommendation) to the Committee on Academic Misconduct. The final decision in the case, however, remains the prerogative of the Committee.

4.1 When an instructor recommends a course of action, the report should indicate what loss of academic credit is involved. The Committee believes that a student found guilty of academic misconduct in a course has forfeited the right to any credit in that course, and recommends as part of its sanction that instructors assign the grade of "E" for the entire course.

5.0 If the accused student either denies guilt or is unsure as to what action to take, and the instructor has evidence of guilt, the instructor's report should include a written statement asking the committee to investigate the possibility of academic misconduct, and then follow the procedures outlined in sections 2 and 3. A student who denies guilt should be allowed to continue in the course without prejudice pending a decision by the Committee. Should the course end before a hearing can be scheduled, the instructor should assign the grade of incomplete (I).

6.0 The student shall always have the right to be heard by the Committee, if he so requests.

7.0 An accused student who has been involved in a previous case of academic misconduct must be brought to hearing by the Committee.

C. Procedure in Committee Hearings

1. When the Committee receives the report of a case, a hearing will be scheduled if there is a previous offense, if the student denies the charge, or if the student requests a hearing. In other cases, the Committee will review the report and determine from the evidence whether the student is guilty or cleared of charges. If the Committee applies a sanction without a hearing, the student still has the option of being heard at a subsequent hearing.

2. The student will be notified of the alleged offense and any additional details to ensure that he is clearly informed of the nature of the charges against him with sufficient particulars that he can prepare an answer in his defense to the charges. The student is asked to submit a written statement responding to these charges in sufficient time that it may be reviewed by the Committee prior to the hearing.
3. If the student needs assistance in preparing for a hearing before the Committee, he is encouraged to consult with staff persons such as a member of the faculty, or a staff member from the Office of Student Services, or the student personnel dean of his college. He also may bring witnesses to the meeting if they are pertinent to the case.

4. Present at the hearing are the student, the instructor bringing the charge, or a representative of that department, the appropriate members of the Committee, a representative of the Office of Student Services and the personnel dean of the student's college. There may be present also a University faculty or staff member of the student's choice to act as his counsel, as well as witnesses appearing in his behalf.

5. The hearing is opened with a reading to the student of the charges placed against him. Any separation of witnesses is determined by the Committee. Both the instructor and the student are questioned by the Committee in each other's presence. The student may present evidence by testimony or otherwise, and call witnesses in his behalf. The student or his representative has the right to question witnesses against him. After all pertinent facts have been developed, the student is excused and the voting members of the Committee deliberate on their decision. When the deliberation is over the student is brought back and notified of the Committee's decision.

6. The objective of the Committee is to develop all pertinent facts and circumstances that surround the reported misconduct. If guilt is determined, the Committee then determines the appropriate disciplinary action to be taken.

7. When the student is informed in writing of the decision of the Committee, he is also notified that he has ten days in which to appeal the decision to the Provost.

8. In the absence of any appeal, or in the denial of an appeal by the Provost, the action of the Committee stands and goes into effect. If the appeal is granted and the decision of the Committee is either overturned or modified, the Provost notifies the student and the Committee of his decision and his reasons for doing so.

Mail and inquiries for the Committee on Academic Misconduct should be sent to 203 Administration Building, 190 North Oval Mall.

/mh
Cheating subject to discipline
By Joyce Nettles
11-2-78

Plagiarism is the most common complaint in academic misconduct cases, according to a faculty member on the Committee on Academic Misconduct (COAM).

Students most often cheat in introductory courses on the 100 level such as math and English, Peter W. Pappas, professor of zoology, said.

Students feel it is easier to cheat in these courses because they are so large, he said.

COAM investigates and establishes procedures for the investigation of all reported cases of student academic misconduct.

The committee also determines disciplinary actions for cases of academic misconduct.

Last year COAM heard approximately 60 cases of academic misconduct, although not all students were found guilty, Pappas said.

"The records for all cases of academic misconduct are confidential and are kept indefinitely," Pappas added.

If a student is found innocent the records of the case are destroyed. However, if the student is convicted the records of the case can be noted on the student's transcript, if the case is severe enough, Pappas said.

When a student has been accused of academic misconduct the instructor must notify the student of the charge.

The instructor files a written report to the chairperson of the academic unit if a student is suspected of committing academic misconduct.

The department chairperson reports the case to COAM. If there is no record of a previous offense, or the student denies the charge, the committee will schedule a hearing.

The student also can request a hearing. If the student is found guilty, COAM always recommends to the department that the student receive a grade of 'F' for the course, Pappas said.

Although COAM recommends that the student fail the course, the department does not have to follow COAM's recommendation — but most departments do, Pappas added.

The least severe form of disciplinary action is admonition. A letter is sent to the student stating that he has been found guilty.

Students may be placed on probation for a time period which is specified in the sanction handed down by COAM. Students involved in more severe cases of academic misconduct can be suspended or dismissed from the university.

Students can be suspended from the university for no less than four quarters, and dismissed for no less than four full quarters.

COAM has no jurisdiction over cases in professional colleges with their own published honor codes (law, medicine, dentistry and veterinary medicine.)

William M. Johnson, assistant dean of veterinary medicine, said there are very few cases of academic misconduct reported in veterinary medicine.

Not many students in agriculture are accused of academic misconduct. "I doubt if we average two or three a year," said Austin Ritchie of the College of Agriculture.

The committee consists of six faculty members, two graduate students, two undergraduate students and the vice president for student services, who is a non-voting member.

---

Cheating reports lower at OSU
By Martha Carson
5-4-79

Despite a report by the Carnegie Council on Policy Studies in Higher Education that cheating is increasing on American college campuses, OSU does not seem to reflect that trend.

There were about 60 cases of academic misconduct brought before the committee on academic misconduct last year, said Peter Pappas, OSU associate professor of zoology and chairman of the committee.

So far this year, 35 cases were brought for hearings and there are 11 pending cases, Pappas said. There probably will be more toward the end of the quarter.

However, the true amount of academic misconduct "may not be reflected in those numbers," he said.

A student accused of cheating must be informed of what the charge is exactly and there must be some evidence against the student, Jackson said. The professor informs the chairman of the division of the infraction and from that chairman the case goes to the committee.

The recommended penalty for a student found guilty of academic misconduct is an "E" for the course.

U.S. District Judge Joseph P. Kinney has dismissed a suit filed last year against Ohio State University by a former OSU veterinary student who was suspended for an honor code violation.

Kinney dismissed the action Monday after Cheryl Bleicker, 28, who filed the suit, requested it be dropped.

John C. McDonald, an attorney representing the university and the OSU College of Veterinary Medicine, said he would not comment since the dismissal action was requested by Miss Bleicker.

Neither Miss Bleicker nor her attorney could be reached for comment.

The suit charged that in suspending Miss Bleicker, the student council and the executive committee of the college had violated her constitutional rights to due process.

She was suspended after being found guilty of violating the school's honor code through "deception with an attempt to cheat." The charge against her involved an examination she took in November 1979.
Plagiarism of term papers can damage students' future

By Judi Perlman

3-13-81

Students who buy professionally written papers from term paper companies may jeopardize more than their grades.

The use of professionally written term papers will be a "serious and grave error that will follow the student for a long time," said Mark S. Auburn, associate professor of English.

Auburn, chairman of the Committee on Academic Misconduct, said many students who plagiarized were suspended from the university.

Although selling professionally written term papers is not yet illegal in Ohio, OSU forbids advertisements from professional research companies in its publications, Auburn said.

According to the Student Code of Rights and Responsibilities, an imposition of anyone else's material is forbidden, he said.

Selling term papers is illegal in New York, Maryland and Pennsylvania. Auburn said he hopes Ohio's state legislators will take action.

The university, however, is already doing something about company-bought papers. Catalogs are "floating around campus departments and the faculty is aware and watching," Auburn said.

An instructor may be able to detect a false paper by checking its title or its subject matter in the catalog, Auburn said.

Auburn advised faculty members to become "attuned to the students' style of writing so that they could more easily recognize a paper written by someone else. Instructors should make parts of a term paper due throughout the quarter, Auburn said. For students who wait until the end of the quarter, it is a good teaching situation. For those who buy a term paper, at least it forces them to break the paper apart to submit notes and a rough draft, he said.

"Companies say that the students just read the papers and get ideas. If this is the case, students should use a footnote attributing the paper," Auburn said. "I've never heard of students doing that."
Cheating
Funding shortage aids dishonest students

By Leslie Compson
Lantern staff writer 3-31-82

OSU's budget crisis is turning out to be a blessing for those not-so-honest students running computer programs.

Douglas Kerr, chairman of the Committee on Academic Misconduct, said a lack of funds is making it harder to curtail computer program cheating.

According to Kerr, most cheating occurs when students become too frustrated with computer problems and use cheating as a shortcut. If there was more money to hire supervisors, students would seek them out for help instead of resorting to cheating, he said.

The committee reviews about four cases of cheating each quarter, Kerr said.

One reason for the increase in cheating may be because more students are taking computer programming courses, Kerr said. "Perhaps we are getting more people in computer programming now who shouldn't be in it."

The large number of jobs in the field make it attractive to students, Kerr said.

While Kerr reviews only four or five cases of cheating every quarter, some teachers report the number of students who are not caught is much higher.

Five thousand students enroll in Computer and Information Science 211 and 212 each year, said Lynn R. Ziegler, assistant professor of computer science.

"211 is required for all business majors and is the first course computer and information science majors in business school are required to take," he said.

"We've got a lot of people desperate to get into business school and it's harder," Ziegler said. "The net effect is that we have a huge number desperate to get through this course."

According to Ziegler, computer program cheating occurs in two ways. "Students either turn in two lab assignments where every statement is identical, or where every sentence says the same thing but is individually paraphrased."

Ziegler estimated that about 10 percent are cheating, but "we only catch five or six a quarter."

Lester F. Smith, associate professor of Engineering Graphics 200, said there is a problem with computer program cheating because "we give more difficult problems so there is a greater frustration level."

The problems given to the 1,400 to 1,500 students enrolled in Smith's course each year are problems students will encounter in computer programming jobs, Smith said. The skills learned in his course will be used in every engineering major pursued, he said.

"At least a third of my students do not honor the statement in my syllabus which says that solutions to all problems should represent your own work and only your own work," Smith said.

"I personally would like to have facilities where we could schedule labs like the Chemistry and Physics departments do, where students can do all their lab work."

"But that would entail a tremendous amount of funding, at least three to four times the amount of equipment and space made available to the Engineering Graphics Department now," Smith said.

When an instructor suspects a student is cheating, he must talk to the student to find out if the student is actually cheating, Kerr said.

If cheating is involved, the instructor writes a letter to his faculty chairman, who reviews the case. If the chairman deems cheating occurred, the case goes to the Committee on Academic Misconduct, Kerr said.

When a cheating case is reported, the Committee on Academic Misconduct usually recommends that the instructor give the student a failing grade, Kerr said. Besides failing the course, the committee will choose between suspending or dismissing the student.

Suspension allows the student to come back to school, usually after one quarter. Dismissal requires students to sit out a specific number of quarters and then reapply to OSU for acceptance again.
Students cheat on writing assignments by copying, using work of local sources

By Jim Destefani
Lantern staff writer 4-27-82

Term papers paraphrased from a source, written by groups of students or ghost written locally are bigger problems for administrators than pre-written papers bought through the mail, Howard G. Sachs, associate provost for academic affairs, said Monday.

"Students who buy pre-written papers are usually in a big panic," he said. "They're gambling the paper they get is a good one. I really don't think a lot of students turn to those." Sachs said a more common practice is to find a source for a paper and paraphrase the needed material.

"It's far easier to find a book on the subject and plagiarize than to go out and buy a paper," he said.

Sachs also said groups of students sometimes write term papers and use them in different quarters or for different sections of the same class. He said they usually are caught when a faculty member recalls seeing the paper before.

"Faculty talk about these things," he said. "They may remember certain things about a paper."

Sachs said ghost writers who advertise research, rewriting and editing services locally are another problem for administrators.

One Lantern advertiser, a professional librarian offering research and rewriting services, said he would research a term paper for $10 an hour. He declined to actually write the paper, though, saying "it may not be illegal, but it is unethical."

The issue of pre-written term papers first surfaced in 1981 when Pacific Research, a Seattle firm which sells term papers, was accused by the postal service of using the mails to make a profit through misrepresentation. As part of an out-court settlement the company agreed to release the names of all students who bought papers after Sept. 16, 1981.

OSU received a list of students who purchased papers from Pacific Research in March. Sachs said the list contained less than 10 names because the company was required to disclose only names of clients since September.

Sachs said each case is being investigated, but he does not believe pre-written papers are a major problem.

"It's fairly easy now to spot (pre-written papers)," he said. "Many faculty members bought catalogs from companies like Pacific Research, he added.

The Ohio legislature also has taken notice of the problem of pre-written papers. House Bill 215, sponsored by Rep. John Begala, D-Kent, would make it illegal to sell the papers. The bill has not yet come up for vote on the House floor.

Students who are caught cheating are subject to punishment by the OSU Committee on Academic Misconduct and may be dismissed from the university, suspended or placed on probation. Sachs said the committee hears about 150 to 200 cases of misconduct a year. About one-half of those involve plagiarism, he said.
More cheaters reprimanded by stricter professor patrol

By Janice McCoy
Lantern staff writer 9-28-82

It's that time of year again — parties, football games, term papers and exams.

For students, autumn quarter means hard work and good times, but for the Committee on Academic Misconduct the new season brings frequent sessions, which will determine the fate of students who have been caught cheating.

The 10-member committee, composed of six faculty members, two graduate students and two undergraduate students, will meet an average of twice a week during the school year, said Howard G. Sachs, associate provost of academic affairs and coordinator for the misconduct committee.

Sachs said the committee heard almost 200 cases last year, an increase from previous years. He does not attribute the increase to more cheating on the part of the students but to better reporting by instructors. "The instructors just didn't turn in the cases as often in the past," Sachs said.

Describing what he called "local justice," Sachs said many instructors used to handle the case without the help of the committee. He said the instructor would make an agreement with the student, promising not to report the incident to the committee if the student consented to settle for an "E" in the course.

"The faculty should bring the case to the attention of the committee even if there is any doubt in their minds," Sachs said. "It is not a bad reflection on the instructors if they have a student brought before the committee. This is an educational committee, not a punitive one," he added.

He said the objective of the committee is to "maintain the integrity of the educational process. We want to be fair, to ensure that students who are doing their own work are being evaluated fairly. An honest effort should equal an honest grade," Sachs said.

The penalties can range from a letter of reprimand or academic probation to dismissal from the university for up to four or more quarters, depending on the violation and other circumstances. "You can bet that a graduate student who plagiarizes will very likely be suspended, maybe dismissed," Sachs said. "But the freshman will probably only be put on probation."

Sachs said instructors are catching more plagiarists because faculty and graduate students are able to catch small changes in writing style or type.
Exam imposers are dead ringers

Chances are that the student who looks more nervous than others at an exam should not be there taking the test in the first place. He is an imposer, known in the academic community as a ringer.

Howard G. Sachs, associate provost of academic affairs and coordinator of the Committee on Academic Misconduct, said this method of cheating is not as widespread as others. Yet instructors and the misconduct committee, which hears cases of academic misconduct, consider it more serious than other forms of cheating.

"Basically, having someone else take the test for you is dumb," Sachs said. "If you get caught, you, and the person who took the test for you, can both expect to sit out at least one quarter, usually more."

Sachs said the infraction is considered more serious because it "is deliberate, preplanned cheating. Getting a ringer is an act of desperation."

He said penalties can range from one to three quarters suspension to a dismissal of four or more quarters, which would require the student to reapply for admission to the university.

Students will find a straightforward statement concerning the seriousness of hiring a ringer when the Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities is approved. The revision, which will be reviewed by the Board of Trustees in October, states "the serving as or enlisting the assistance of a ringer, or substitute for another student in taking an exam" is an infraction against the code of student conduct.

Of the nearly 200 cases heard by the misconduct committee last year, Sachs said very few dealt with ringers. "There is just such a risk involved that not as many students get caught up in it." But he said the total number of ringers is hard to determine.

Sachs said there are ways to catch ringers, but no method is foolproof. Many departments check for identification before handing out exams though there has never been a policy requiring them to do so, he said.

"The problem with checking for identification is that it is very time-consuming because the I.D.s have to be checked against the roster," Sachs said. "It also puts the instructor in the role of a police officer, which we don't want."

"We've also had several cases where the student was caught because the proctor did not recognize them," he said. "Instructors might not know students' names, but many of them do recognize faces."

Ringers in the anthropology department might not have it as easy as in other departments. Mike Mahaney, a graduate teaching associate, said the students in his classes must place their I.D. on the desk while they are taking the test. The proctors then check the I.D.s during the test.

Mahaney, one of two graduate TAs on the misconduct committee, said many of the anthropology instructors use this method of checking I.D.s even though they are not required to.

"It's a good method because it is a way of preventing ringers without taking up class time."

Other preventive practices used by anthropology instructors include turning in student I.D.s before taking exams and signature checks. "Nothing is going to completely stop the students from trying to use ringers, but we can help prevent it," Mahaney said.

The computer and information science and math departments have taken similar measures.

"It's up to the individual instructors, but many of them will ask for identification when the student hands in the exam," said Robert Gold, associate professor of mathematics and a vice chairman of the mathematics department. "Between the I.D. checks and the fact that we try to seat the students according to TA sections, we think we have this pretty well under control," Gold said.

With the beginning of a new quarter, Sachs offered some tongue-in-cheek advice for students who might think of using a ringer. "You better be confident that the person you hire will do better than you; you also better find someone who won't talk, smile, or be identifiable in any way."

Joking aside, Sachs said, "The problem with ringers is that students think the faculty isn't alert to the problem and they think they can get away with it. Well, that's not always true."
Tempers are flaring among students in the Productions and Operations Management 630 class, who were informed that the exam they had taken Oct. 14 would not be counted.

Barry E. King, assistant professor of management science, discovered Oct. 15, that an estimated 20 tests were stolen from his office in Hagerty Hall before he administered the exam.

King said he had locked the tests in his office the night before the exam because the vault, where tests are usually stored, was too small to accommodate almost 500 tests.

"The decision to scratch the test wasn't made until late Monday afternoon after Dean (Robert E.) Georges and myself discussed the situation and any other alternatives at great length," King said. He said they also conferred with Don Good, campus ombudsman, before coming to a decision.

"It's my belief that thieves and cheaters shouldn't benefit from their activities at all...and no matter what decision I made, some group of students would have been disadvantaged," King said.

King said the exam will not be counted and that the remaining exam and the final will weigh more heavily. "Good students will be good students throughout the quarter. I've never known an A student not to be an A student at the end of the quarter," King said.

The decision upset many students who believed they were unjustly punished. "I was upset because I did well on the test," said Judy Lang, a senior from Galloway. The only people being hurt are the ones who did well.

"I think they should handle a situation like this differently in the future," Lang continued. "A policy needs to be established so some other kind of action can take place in the future."

Other students are concerned about the lack of a university or departmentalwide policy involving the theft of tests.

"There should be some way that students can be represented when a professor goes to make such a decision," said Mark Miller, a junior from Delaware. "I would have liked to have had the opportunity to offer some alternatives rather than just having the test thrown out the window."

"They need to set up a university policy that is followed where students can be involved in decisions. We're the ones affected. The students are up in the air; we have no idea where we stand in the class," Miller said.

"Since there is no departmental policy, King's decision to scratch the test is not going to hurt anyone except those students who did well," said Scott Bowman, a junior from Columbus.

King said, "I can understand the other side of the situation — I'm not immune to that. But we're talking breaking and entering here, an overt effort to compromise the examination. It wasn't casual; it was intentional."

Robert Georges, associate dean of administrative science, said the incident has "re-emphasized the need to be as careful as we possibly can. We want to be fair, to make sure that we've protected the exam process as much as possible."

"In each of these cases, you hope an undesirable thing like this just doesn't happen. People cheating just create problems for everyone, problems that are very hard to deal with. It's too damn bad. We're caught up in the question of do we let it ride, and in a sense condone cheating, or do we take action?"
Attached you will find a copy of the revised Procedures of The Committee on Academic Misconduct. I urge you to take the few minutes to read this material, and then save it for future reference.

The maintenance of the integrity of the teaching-learning process is the special and personal responsibility of each of us, whether faculty, staff, student or administrator. It is a great disservice to that integrity and to the vast majority of students when we ignore instances of suspected academic misconduct. The Faculty Rules established a mechanism for dealing with such cases, the Committee on Academic Misconduct. This Committee of faculty and students is charged with the responsibility of examining the evidence in an unbiased fashion, determining guilt or innocence, and then imposing sanctions on those found guilty. Their task as a committee is a difficult one, but essential if we are to guarantee the rights and interests of both the accused and the institution. The Procedures of the Committee, taken in concert with the newly revised and adopted Code of Student Conduct, serve that purpose.

The Chairman of the Committee for the academic year, Professor Bernard Bowman (2-5772), and the Coordinator of the Committee, Associate Provost Howard Sachs (2-5881), are available to discuss the Procedures with you. They are also more than willing to assist in efforts to prevent instances of misconduct by suggesting changes in examination procedures or other means. Please feel free to call with any questions, whether they are general or pertain to a specific case.

Additional copies of the Procedures, as well as copies of the Code of Student Conduct, are available from this office.

DHJ/HGS/arb
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PROCEDURES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

1.0 The Committee exists to protect the academic standards and integrity of the University.

1.1 The Committee is established under Rule 3335-5-54 of the Rules of the Faculty. It operates under the Rules known collectively as the Code of Student Conduct including Rules 3335-23-01, 3335-25, -27, -29, and -31 and specifically under procedures as adopted by the Committee.

1.2 The members of the Committee include:

Six (6) faculty members, with vote
Two (2) graduate students, with vote
Two (2) undergraduate students, with vote
Coordinator, without vote
Dean of Student Life, or designee, without vote

2.0 Any student, except those in a professional college with a published honor code, will be brought before the Committee if charged with academic misconduct.

3.0 Academic misconduct is defined as any activity which tends to compromise the academic integrity of the institution or subvert the educational process.

3.1 Whenever academic misconduct by a student is suspected, the instructor should inform the student of the allegation. The presence of a colleague with the instructor at any subsequent meeting with the student is strongly recommended.

3.2 Instructors should attempt to develop sufficient facts in the case to allow the case to be processed through the appropriate channels.

3.3 Students suspected of academic misconduct, whether acknowledging involvement or not, should be allowed to continue in the course without prejudice pending action by the Committee. If the course ends before the Committee has acted, the instructor should assign the student the grade of Incomplete in accord with Rule 3335-7-21.

3.4 The instructor should file a written report on the alleged academic misconduct. The report should be as complete as possible, and should have all relevant evidence attached. Whenever possible, original documents, such as the allegedly plagiarized paper, test, computer print-outs, etc. should be submitted and sources of plagiarized materials should also be provided, with the passages plagiarized clearly marked.
3.5 The report prepared by the instructor will be reviewed by the chairman of the academic unit and then transmitted to the Coordinator of the Committee, 203 Administration Building, 190 North Oval Mall. If possible, the report should be hand-carried and marked "Confidential."

4.0 The Coordinator, on behalf of the Committee, will file the charge of academic misconduct and notify the accused student of the charge.

5.0 Hearings of the Committee are conducted in order to develop the facts and circumstances.

5.1 Students charged with academic misconduct are expected to appear before the Committee, although a student may waive the right to personally appear.

5.2 A student charged with academic misconduct may review the case file prior to the hearing.

5.3 Hearings of the Committee are operated under the provisions of Rule 3335-27-04 of the Administrative Code.

5.4 The only persons who may be present at a hearing are those invited by the accused and those whose presence has been requested by the Coordinator. Normally those present in addition to witnesses and advisor for the accused will include the Committee members, the person(s) who filed the report of alleged misconduct or departmental representative, the college secretary or designee, and the university ombudsman or designee (as observer).

5.5 When more than one student is accused in an incident, one or both of the accused may petition for separate hearings. The Coordinator of the Committee will be responsible for reviewing such requests and promptly informing the accused of the decision on the petition.

5.6 An accused student may request a continuance of the hearing for good cause. The Coordinator of the Committee will be responsible for reviewing such a request and will promptly inform the accused of the decision on the petition.

5.7 Regional Campus and Agricultural Technical Institute students only may elect to have cases heard by a subcommittee of the Committee on Academic Misconduct which will meet at the regional campus or Agricultural Technical Institute. In those cases heard by a subcommittee, the subcommittee will make recommendations to the Committee which will render the final decision.
6.0 Decisions of the Committee

6.1 Under Rules 3335-29-02,-03,-04 the Committee on Academic Misconduct may impose the following sanctions.

   a. Warning
   b. Disciplinary Probation
   c. Suspension
   d. Dismissal

6.2 The Committee may additionally recommend to the instructor of record that a failing grade be issued in that course.

6.3 Records of the Committee on Academic Misconduct are considered confidential. Copies of sanction letters are sent only to those university officers with a valid need to know, such as the college secretary who is in charge of student records. The Office of Registration Services is informed when the sanction imposed is suspension or dismissal.

7.0 Students are urged to consult the Code of Student Conduct regarding operation of the Committee on Academic Misconduct. Students at regional campuses or at the Agricultural Technical Institute are also urged to consult local campus publications.
Subject: Academic Misconduct

Date: October 31, 1983

From: Diether H. Haenicke, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

To: University Faculty and Graduate Teaching Associates

Attached are copies of Procedures of the Committee on Academic Misconduct. Each year the Committee reminds the instructional staff of its obligation to help protect the integrity of the University. Rule 3335-5-54 states that all instances of suspected academic misconduct shall be reported to the Committee. Composed of faculty and students, the Committee establishes procedures for dealing with academic misconduct, conducts hearings on alleged charges against students, and imposes sanctions on those students found guilty.

The Chairman of the Committee for the academic year, Professor Bernard Bowman (2-5772), and the Coordinator of the Committee, Dr. Inez Cardozo-Freeman (2-8822), will discuss the Procedures with you should you wish clarification or assistance. Associate Provost Francille M. Firebaugh has overall responsibility for Academic Misconduct and general concerns can be directed to her (2-5881).

I strongly recommend your reading the enclosed newsletter about academic misconduct written by Ombudsman Donald W. Good. Dr. Good is an ex-officio member of our Committee on Academic Misconduct and has a broad perspective of the issues associated with academic misconduct.

DHH/ICF/mab

Attachment
1.0 The Committee exists to protect the academic standards and integrity of the University.

1.1 The Committee is established under Rule 3335-5-54 of the Rules of the Faculty. It operates under the Rules known collectively as the Code of Student Conduct including Rules 3335-23-01, 3335-25, -27, -29, and -31 and specifically under procedures as adopted by the Committee.

1.2 The members of the Committee include:

Six (6) faculty members, with vote
Two (2) graduate students, with vote
Two (2) undergraduate students, with vote
Coordinator, without vote
Dean of Student Life, or designee, without vote

2.0 Any student, except those in a professional college with a published honor code, will be brought before the Committee if charged with academic misconduct.

3.0 Academic misconduct is defined as any activity which tends to compromise the academic integrity of the institution or subvert the educational process.

3.1 Whenever academic misconduct by a student is suspected, the instructor should inform the student of the allegation. The presence of a colleague with the instructor at any subsequent meeting with the student is strongly recommended.

3.2 Instructors should attempt to develop sufficient facts in the case to allow the case to be processed through the appropriate channels.

3.3 Students suspected of academic misconduct, whether acknowledging involvement or not, should be allowed to continue in the course without prejudice pending action by the Committee. If the course ends before the Committee has acted, the instructor should assign the student the grade of Incomplete in accord with Rule 3335-7-21.

3.4 The instructor should file a written report on the alleged academic misconduct. The report should be as complete as possible, and should have all relevant evidence attached. Whenever possible, original documents, such as the allegedly plagiarised paper, test, computer print-outs, etc., should be submitted and sources of plagiarized materials should also be provided, with the passages plagiarized clearly marked.
3.5 The report prepared by the instructor will be reviewed by the chairman of the academic unit and then transmitted to the Coordinator of the Committee, 1110 Lincoln Tower, 1800 Cannon Drive. If possible, the report should be hand-carried and marked "Confidential."

4.0 The Coordinator, on behalf of the Committee, will file the charge of academic misconduct and notify the accused student of the charge.

5.0 Hearings of the Committee are conducted in order to develop the facts and circumstances.

5.1 Students charged with academic misconduct are expected to appear before the Committee, although a student may waive the right to personally appear.

5.2 A student charged with academic misconduct may review the case file prior to the hearing.

5.3 Hearings of the Committee are operated under the provisions of Rule 3335-27-04 of the Administrative Code.

5.4 The only persons who may be present at a hearing are those invited by the accused and those whose presence has been requested by the Coordinator. Normally those present in addition to witnesses and advisor for the accused will include the Committee members, the persons(s) who filed the report of alleged misconduct or departmental representative, the college secretary or designee, and the university ombudsman or designee (as observer).

5.5 When more than one student is accused in an incident, one or both of the accused may petition for separate hearings. The Coordinator of the Committee will be responsible for reviewing such requests and promptly informing the accused of the decision on the petition.

5.6 An accused student may request a continuance of the hearing for good cause. The Coordinator of the Committee will be responsible for reviewing such a request and will promptly inform the accused of the decision on the petition.

5.7 Regional Campus and Agricultural Technical Institute students only may elect to have cases heard by a subcommittee of the Committee on Academic Misconduct which will meet at the regional campus or Agricultural Technical Institute. In those cases heard by a subcommittee, the subcommittee will make recommendations to the Committee which will render the final decision.
6.0 Decisions of the Committee

6.1 Under Rules 3335-29-02, -03, -04, the Committee on Academic Misconduct may impose the following sanctions.
   a. Warning
   b. Disciplinary Probation
   c. Suspension
   d. Dismissal

6.2 The Committee may additionally recommend to the instructor of record that a failing grade be issued in that course.

6.3 Records of the Committee on Academic Misconduct are considered confidential. Copies of sanction letters are sent only to those university officers with a valid need to know, such as the college secretary who is in charge of student records. The Office of Registration Services is informed when the sanction imposed is suspension or dismissal.

7.0 Students are urged to consult the Code of Student Conduct regarding operation of the Committee on Academic Misconduct. Students at regional campuses or at the Technical Institute are also urged to consult local campus publications.
Dear Colleague:

One of the issues that makes for markedly uncomfortable, frustrating, and lamentable relations between faculty and students is academic misconduct. Most frequently such activity appears as plagiarism or "dishonest practices in connection with examinations" although it is by no means limited to such activities. Whatever guise it assumes, academic misconduct represents the ultimate deterioration in the essential trust that characterizes, or should characterize, the student-teacher relationship or the learning-teaching process. Like most breaches of ethics, single incidents of academic misconduct cannot be viewed in isolation. Time and again I find myself explaining to students that such activity has compromised the rights of other students, the inherent trust of the faculty, the legitimacy of the examination process, the value of the college degree, and the integrity of the University itself. Indeed, one of our most difficult tasks is to help the students understand that their actions have rippled through the full system, touching persons they don't know in ways that they don't initially suspect.

In regard to academic misconduct, the complex process of educating the student and preserving the integrity of the institution falls to us all. While there are many ways in which to do this, I want to suggest two in the brief space available. First we can act to prevent academic misconduct in a variety of ways. We can provide clear directions about "working together" in lab reports or group projects; we can give general guidance about documenting sources; we should, whenever feasible, provide alternate forms of (or scrambled answer sheets for) examinations in crowded classrooms; we can keep our exams relatively secure; we can appropriately space students during examinations if conditions permit; we should always, frequently with the assistance of others, monitor our examinations; we should be aware of, and make our students aware of, statements regarding academic misconduct published by the Provost's Office and in the Code of Student Rights and Responsibilities, the freshman English theme folder, and the University College Survey ext; and we can always advise students to check first with us whenever they have doubt about the substance or procedure of any course requirement.

Despite the help we are able to provide, some students will nonetheless, and for many different reasons, find themselves in trouble because they have innocently or knowingly broken the rules governing academic misconduct. And this brings me to the second way in which we must act to serve the student, the faculty, and the institution. The Faculty Rule 335-5-54) makes clear that "Each instructor shall report to the committee on academic misconduct all instances of what he believes may be academic misconduct." All things considered, that is the best single piece of advice the institution currently has to offer. I am aware of a considerable divergence of opinion on the issue of such misconduct and the incautious procedures, and I understand the impulse to manage any incident without distance from the Committee: students deserve a second chance; the gathering and submission of materials is allegedly time-consuming; the Committee may be too lenient or too severe; pedagogy may come under close scrutiny; let's not make such a fuss over a single incident; c. Equally understandable is the extent of psychological drain caused by the discovery of misconduct, the hearings themselves, and the deep disappointment and personal outrage that characterize almost all breaches of trust. But if we are asking the students to conform to a conventional standard of ethics by refraining from misconduct (and thereby uphold the integrity of the University), then we have a responsibility to them and to the institution
to abide by the rules when we discover that some students have compromised that integrity. The time involved in forwarding a case is neither burdensome nor ill-spent. It is a vital, if unorthodox, part of the educational process, and we the faculty are responsible for it.

Numerous contacts with students, faculty, and the Committee on Academic Misconduct suggest a great variation in the handling of persons suspected of unethical practice. Some of us may be inclined to "make a deal" with a student when we suspect but cannot prove misconduct; others might decide to give a student an F on the specific assignment in question. Some of us may threaten to forward the case to the Committee only if the student won't admit guilt; others might ignore a plagiarized piece of work and give the student an opportunity to make it up. As is obvious, when each of us is free to be the ad hoc witness and the imposer of sanctions, systematic fairness and consistency, as difficult as they are even under ideal conditions, take on an arbitrary or capricious cast that in itself compromises institutional integrity.

As I have observed its deliberations, the Committee represents the University's attempt to provide the student and the faculty member with an objective third party before which all relevant details might be aired. It is a fact-finding and truth-seeking, rather than an adversarial, forum. In addition, the Committee, having more information about the student (including knowledge of prior offenses) than any individual faculty member can have, is the only unit empowered by the University to impose the specified sanctions for academic misconduct. As open-and-shut as some cases might seem, the process does provide protection for the student and faculty alike. Whether or not the student claims innocence, he is permitted to relate to a disinterested party his view of the incident(s). And the faculty member, by following the prescribed procedure, has fulfilled his obligation to the institution. To move away from the established mechanism invites accusations of arbitrary treatment that would be difficult for the University to countenance.

Institutional integrity is a term as grand as it is elusive. In my conversations with students, I attempt to explain that the term implies not only the freedom to seek the truth and the obligation to broadcast the truth, but also impeccable motives, fair and honest dealings with one another, and a reasonable adherence to our written policies. It is a responsibility shared by all community members. As the principle applies to academic misconduct, it is the students' duty to do their own work with the aid and ready guidance of the faculty, and it is the faculty's responsibility, whenever the student has broken the trust, to use the existing mechanism to assure, as nearly as that is possible, equitable treatment for all.

Donald W. Good
University Ombudsman
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340 Ohio Union
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Columbus, Ohio 43210

OSU
Misconduct hearings backed up until spring

By Michael Marlow
Lantern staff writer 1-13-84

Patience is a virtue.
But for some students, it may also be a necessity.

Because of an increase in reported student academic misconduct, OSU's Committee on Academic Misconduct is facing a backlog of cases to be heard.

"We have already run out of hearing time for this quarter," said Francille Firebaugh, associate provost for academic affairs.

Cases brought to the attention of the committee now will not be heard until Spring quarter, she said.

The committee deals with cases of students charged with cheating, plagiarism or other forms of misconduct and hears about four cases a week.

If a student is found in violation of the student code, the committee may impose punishments ranging from a letter of reprimand to dismissal from the university.

To help prevent backlog problems, Firebaugh is proposing to increase the number of committee members. If this happens, subcommittees could be formed to hear the individual cases, she said.

However, due to the procedures involved in getting Firebaugh's proposal approved, it may not go into effect until Spring quarter.

The committee, which hears an average of 150 cases a year, is composed of six faculty members, two graduate and two undergraduate students. Seven members must be present before the committee can render an official decision.

Since faculty and student members often have other obligations, having seven persons present is sometimes difficult, Firebaugh said.

Last year at this time, there were 19 cases pending before the committee. Now there are 44, said Inez Cardozo-Freeman, associate professor of comparative studies in the humanities.

"I don't think there is an increase in misconduct," said Cardozo-Freeman, the committee's coordinator. "I think there is an increase in vigilance on part of the faculty."
Cheaters face fast hearings

By June Veatch
Lantern staff writer

Students accused of cheating now do not have to wait long for a hearing.

The Committee on Academic Misconduct has eliminated a backlog of cases, and dramatically reduced the waiting time before a misconduct case is heard.

A year ago students had to wait two or three quarters before the committee heard the cases. During spring quarter the committee heard cases within only two weeks after getting them, said John Sena, committee coordinator.

The problem was solved by increasing the size of the committee, an idea proposed by Francine Firebaugh, acting provost for academic affairs. She was concerned over student welfare and wanted to make the system more efficient, Sena said.

Sena said the committee had been too small to handle the caseload. The committee used to have five faculty members, two graduate and two undergraduate students. It was enlarged spring quarter, 1984, to 15 faculty members, five graduate and five undergraduate students.

"Charges of academic misconduct weigh heavily on students. It was unfair to keep them waiting months to hear their cases," Sena said.

Beverly Jensen, a graduate student in home economics education and new president of the council of graduate students, said with the change in committee size, students now are not held in limbo as they were before. Jensen was one of the students appointed to the committee in 1984.

The need for more members was not because there is more cheating, Sena said the overload had been a continuing problem. The number of cases has increased slightly, but he believes it is because of greater faculty vigilance.

More than half the cases reported involve plagiarism, copying another's work, or collusion, which is two students working together to cheat on exams. Other cases might involve altering forms to get in or out of a class or getting outside help on exams.

The committee encouraged departments to teach students about plagiarism. Sena said sometimes students do not understand that merely taking someone's idea is plagiarism. The committee also sent explanations of it to new foreign students.

The committee is divided into four panels, each with three faculty members, one graduate student and one undergraduate student. There is no problem getting people to serve, Sena said.

The committee members take their work seriously, Sena said. He thinks this is responsible for the success of the committee.

"I have seen them agonize over decisions. Some of these are emotionally wrenching. It's not the kind of committee that you go home and forget about. I have seen them examine moral issues very carefully and arrive at a decision that each person thinks is correct," Sena said.

The University Senate selects faculty members. Students are selected by the president's and advisory boards of the Council of Graduate Students and Undergraduate Student Government.

Cases are heard two or three times a week, with each member serving three or four times a quarter on a panel.

To keep the panels consistent in their decisions, the committee rotates members so no panel has the same membership. This avoids a "hanging jury," Sena said.

He also sits with each panel, which provides consistency, although he does not vote.

After the committee gets a report of academic misconduct from a faculty member, teaching associate or other student, Sena explains the hearing process and advises the accused student.

Besides the panel, the student and accuser and any witnesses take part in the hearing. The student may bring an attorney for advice, but the person may not take part in the hearing.

This graph compares cases of cheating at OSU from summer quarter, 1984, through spring quarter, 1985. Cases are ranked from the most common to the least common types of cheating charges.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Charge</th>
<th>In Violation</th>
<th>Not In Violation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Collusion</td>
<td>47 (32%)</td>
<td>20 (49%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Plagiarism</td>
<td>46 (31%)</td>
<td>7 (17%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Outside help on exam</td>
<td>29 (20%)</td>
<td>12 (29%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Altering OSU paper work</td>
<td>16 (11%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>Altering exam</td>
<td>7 (05%)</td>
<td>1 (02%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6th</td>
<td>&quot;Ringers&quot;</td>
<td>2 (01%)</td>
<td>1 (02%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7th</td>
<td>Bribery</td>
<td>1 (01%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL 148 41 189

Graph courtesy of John Sena
Former student files $130,000 suit against OSU

By Melissa M. McCoy
Lantern staff writer

A former student who was accused of cheating on an exam filed a $130,000 suit against the university.

The claim, filed Oct. 11 in the Court of Claims of Ohio, states that Larry J. Elasas was accused of cheating on a Math 131 exam by his graduate teaching assistant, Al Chou Seash, during autumn quarter 1985.

Elasas said he had circulated a petition in the class to replace Seash because he could not understand his English.

Seash discovered that he was responsible for the petition and then accused him of cheating, Elasas said.

Elasas is asking $130,000 from Seash in addition to the $130,000 suit he has filed against the university.

Seash could not be reached for comment.

Elasas said the university's Committee on Academic Misconduct gave his case Dec. 1, 1985 and did not follow proper procedure during the trial.

According to the suit, only two of 10 voting members of the committee were present to hear the case. The committee proceeded with the hearing.

Elasas said he did not think the necessary number of members needed to judge a case were present.

John F. Sena, currently the coordinator of the academic misconduct committee, presented a statement of three voting faculty members and two voting student members must be present to hear a case.

Sena was not the coordinator of the committee at the time of Elasas' trial.

Elasas said the committee gave the student the option to ask for a trial rescheduled if a quorum is not present. However, students who want to proceed without the quorum may do so, Sena said.

Sena said he is not familiar with Elasas' case and does not know if Elasas was given the option of a postponement.

Francine M. Firebaugh, now acting provost and vice president of academic affairs, was the coordinator of the committee at the time of the trial. She could not be reached for comment.

The committee found Elasas was guilty of academic misconduct and should be punished by being placed on disciplinary probation for 30 days and receiving the failing grade of 'E' for Math 131, according to the suit.

Elasas appealed the decision and was given a second hearing on Feb. 7, 1986. The committee once again found him guilty of academic misconduct.

Elasas then lodged a third appeal on the basis of a lack of a quorum during the second trial. Before the second appeal was brought to trial, Elasas received a letter from Provost Dieder Haenicke in late March stating the decision had been reversed and "all record of disciplinary proceedings would be destroyed."

Elasas said no reason was given for the decision reversal.

Haenicke, now president of Western Michigan University, said he did not remember Elasas' case. He explained he had often heard seven to eight cases a quarter and that it is difficult to remember specific cases.

Elasas said destroying a student's academic misconduct file would not be unusual if the student is found not guilty.

"You don't want to damage someone's reputation if there is any doubt of that person's guilt," Haenicke said.

Elasas said the emotional and psychological stress he suffered while waiting for the decision affected his ability to perform well in his classes.

He said the stress forced him to drop courses and he was no longer a full-time student. He said he lost all of his financial aid and could not return to school even after the decision was reversed because he did not have the money.

"I was spending more time defending myself than being a student," he said.

Elasas was receiving a Pell grant, an Ohio Instructional and a direct grant from the Bureau of Vocational Rehabilitation.

Larry Thompson, an OSU attorney in the president's office, said Ohio State has not received a copy of the suit. Law suits filed against the university are mailed to the office, and it sometimes takes several days or weeks before the copy is received, he said.

Thompson said when the complaint is received he will review it with the help of the Ohio Attorney General. The attorney general acts as legal counsel for the university because it is a state institution, he said.

A response will be filed within 20 days of the reception of the suit.
Students' rights protected by law

By Ina Rene Lubeach
Lantern staff writer

OSU students should be aware of their rights if they are accused of cheating, said Peter Pappas, professor of zoology and chairman of the Committee on Academic Misconduct.

"I suspect that some faculty are acting as judge and jury and providing sentences at the same time. I don't have any idea how often it happens, but I know it does," Pappas said.

A student may be accused of several kinds of cheating, or academic misconduct. They include plagiarism, two students working together to cheat on an examination, altering examinations, bribery and using a ringer — a student who takes an exam for another student.

And the number of academic misconduct cases have increased.

From summer quarter 1984 to spring quarter 1986 there were 189 cases. Before that, Pappas said there were about 70 cases a year.

Pappas said he thought faculty members are enforcing the rules more now.

A student suspected of cheating on a test may feel intimidated when confronted by the professor, Pappas said. The student may assume no rights are applicable and may accept a failing grade.

But a student suspected of academic misconduct has a right to a hearing. The student may have an adviser present. The advisor may be another student, faculty member, academic counselor or even a lawyer, Pappas said.

In order to uphold both the student's and faculty member's rights, the committee recommends that a colleague of the faculty member attend the hearing as a witness. Hearings are usually scheduled within a month of the incident.

"That way we're sure that everybody has a chance to get together the material they feel they need, both the professor and the student," he said. "Unfortunately, a lot of students don't come prepared. I think they're intimidated by the system."

According to the OSU Code of Student Conduct, a professor is required to turn over a case of academic misconduct to the committee. However, many of these cases aren't reported, and that is when students' rights are infringed, Pappas said.

John Sena, coordinator of the committee, thinks students do use their rights. He says he talks to them before hearings to advise them of their rights.

"When I talk to them, I impress upon them that they are assumed to be not in violation of the code of conduct until a case is made against them," Sena said. "My sense is that students feel they have gotten a fair deal," Sena said.

If a student is suspected of academic misconduct, the professor turns in a grade of incomplete, until the case is heard. Students will get a letter grade if they are proved innocent, Pappas said.

The committee may find the student in violation of the code without having clear and convincing evidence, like in a court of law, he said.

Punishment for violation of the code depends on the seriousness of the offense. One of the most serious situations is the ringer, he said.

"In that case, we would likely catch the ringer and we'd also like to catch the ringer," he said. "They would probably both be dismissed or suspended from the university."
Headsets assist cheaters, cause static for professors

By Jason Lovins
Lantern staff writer

A new form of cheating has appeared at Ohio State, spurring warnings to faculty that high technology has a bad side.

A student reported anonymously that another student taking an examination was wearing headphones and receiving answers transmitted from outside the building, said Robert Georges, associate dean of the College of Administrative Science.

"It's unfair as hell to other students when there is cheating going on," Georges said. "It's a symptom of some of the negative things of the electronic age."

Georges investigated the incident as soon as it was reported, but because the observer had no names to give, no evidence of cheating could be found.

John Sena, coordinator of the Committee on Academic Misconduct, said a memo explaining the incident and warning teachers to monitor the use of headsets in classrooms was sent to faculty April 23.

Sena said there are no rules banning headphones from classrooms at Ohio State.

A spokesman for Radio Shack electronics stores said he had not heard of equipment similar to headsets that could be used for transmission.

Sena said although the report of answers being transmitted may be doubtful, it would be easy for students to use tape-recorded crib notes, and teachers should not allow the gadgets to be worn during tests.

June Alexander, professor of history, ordered headphones off for her Monday class. She said she has never had problems with headset-cheaters in her classes, but she thinks precautions are necessary.

"I'm just trying to prevent this from happening," Alexander said. She said she does not want students to be suspicious of other students wearing headsets.

"I'm concerned just as much with the student's integrity."

Alexander said university policy gives students the right to complain if they think a test has not been properly monitored.

"If a student sees a fellow student wearing headphones and thinks he is cheating, he may complain that the test is not being proctored fairly," she said. "I want to avoid that by just ordering that they not wear them during the test."

Some students found the incident surprising, though they see headsets in use frequently.

"I've seen people wearing Walkmans during tests," said Sarah Witters, a sophomore from Greenville. "I'm sure it could be done. But it would be so easy to get caught, you might as well study."

Witters said she has seen the headsets in large, crowded lecture halls, a place where they could go unnoticed.

Steve Gusky, a freshman from Elyria, said the university rules should be updated to eliminate the problem.

"I don't think it's right," Gusky said. "It's not fair to the other students. Just change the rules so they come in with a pencil and paper or whatever."

"It's too easy to get caught," said Jenny Wilson, a sophomore from Greenville. "I've never seen anything like that going on before. Now I'll notice it."
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Ohio State on lookout for plagiarized English papers; today, more students try to plagiarize computer programs, Sena said.

He also has encountered a few cases of students trying to gain access to grades stored in computer data banks.

Such cheating accounts for a minority of the 190 or so cases of academic misconduct reported to Sena's committee this year.

Most incidents investigated by the committee's 15 faculty members and 10 students involved the "garden variety" of academic misconduct, Sena said.

About half the cases involved some form of cheating on tests. Plagiarism accounted for about one-third of the cases. The remainder included such incidents as altering forms or grade reports, Sena said.

state-of-the-art cheaters

Two offenses -- paying another student to take an exam and bribing an instructor for a grade -- are serious enough that perpetrators are automatically suspended from OSU, either for a short term or a designated period of years. Repeat offenders also are dismissed, Sena said. A lesser reprimand is a letter of warning to the student.

Two cases of bribery and two or three cases of students asking "ringers" to take tests for them were reported this year, he said.

Reported incidents of academic misconduct at OSU have increased slightly in recent years. Sena attributes the rise to a more-vigilant faculty rather than to a less-honest student body.

Most students are honest and serious about their academic pursuits, Sena said.

"But otherwise-honest students will resort to cheating when they get in a tight bind" or put too much pressure on themselves to get good grades, he said.

Then, too, the idea of "trying to get something for nothing" appeals to some students, he said. Many go to creative lengths in pursuit of that goal.

One student, for example, wanted to withdraw from a class. He stole stationery from a doctor's office, then forged the doctor's signature at the end of an explanation that the student could no longer attend class because of an appendectomy.

Only problem was, "the doctor was a podiatrist," Sena said.
The University cracks down on cheating

By Patricia Mowesak

John Sessa is an expert on cheating. There are few types of cheating that he has not seen. Sessa is Coordinator of Ohio State's Committee on Academic Misconduct. The committee investigates about 200 cases of suspected student academic misconduct annually.

Sessa explained: "The case is brought before an impartial, objective group to weigh the evidence. The rights of the students are well protected," he said. "The very fact that there is a committee composed of faculty and students is a major element in that protection." Sessa said there are common reasons students get into trouble. Invariably, problems arise from academic misconduct, or lack of planning. Students often can't balance a heavy course load with a part-time job or may spend too much time discovering the social life in the adjacent High Street area.

"And sometimes it is self-imposed pressure or pressure from home," Sessa said. "Academic misconduct at times is a form of rebellion against a curriculum or course." Sessa offered this advice for parents: "If your student has been accused of academic misconduct, don't overreact. He or she will be treated fairly, impartially, and humanely. If the committee decides that a violation of the Code of Student Conduct has occurred, that information does not appear on a transcript, nor is such information ever released without the student's consent. The sanction does not follow the student for the rest of his or her life. Additionally, remember that we care about the welfare of our students," Sessa said. "If we didn't, we would not have become professional educators." And if a student is found to be in violation, that does not mean the student cannot go on to have an outstanding academic career at Ohio State. The number of cases of academic misconduct has increased at Ohio State in the recent past.

Despite that, Sessa doesn't feel today's students are less honest. "Honesty hasn't changed. I think people are basically honest and have enough self-esteem not to compromise themselves." The charge is due more to faculty involvement. "Faculty are more vigilant, more aware of the need to be vigilant. So I think the increase in cases is not because there is more cheating, but because the faculty is more conscientious in reporting it."

Code sets student conduct

Every student who attends Ohio State agrees to live by a Code of Student Conduct. The agreement is part of the admissions process, which formally sets down student guidelines and responsibilities.

Students who violate the code are sent to the Committee on Academic Misconduct. Schuster, Ohio State's coordinator of judicial affairs, deals with cases of nonacademic misconduct.

Every quarter, Schuster presides over about 100 cases that involve theft, falsifying identification, unauthorized presence on University property, loitering, and harassment.

The most common cases are theft or the switching of price tags in the University's bookstores. But theft from other buildings or libraries is also a major problem, she said.

Cases are generally referred to her by campus police or security. Schuster said most cases take about an hour and are handled confidentially between herself and the student. Nine out of 10 times, the students admit to the accused violation.

But about three times a quarter, students refuse to have their cases heard by a judicial panel of three faculty and two students. Similar to the committee on Academic Misconduct, students may use written statements, evidence, and witnesses to present their case. Students are entitled to have advisors, parents, and legal representation present, if they choose. Cases are generally settled within three to six hours.

"We're very particular about providing due process," Schuster said.

Students found in violation of the Code of Student Conduct may face one of four University sanctions: warning, disciplinary probation, suspension, or dismissal. The least serious is a warning, a formal written admonition for the student's action.

Disciplinary probation may be assessed for a specified period of time and carry a number of conditions and restrictions. This is usually accompanied by a "educational sanction," which may include research, restitution, or community service. If the student is suspended, he or she must leave the University and stay away for up to three academic quarters. Eligibility to return is restored at the end of the suspension.

Dismissal separates the student from the University for at least four academic quarters. Reenrollment is not guaranteed. Schuster said repeat offenders are dealt harsher discipline.

"We try to conduct the process in a way which will add to the educational development for the student," she said.

All sanctions remain confidential and do not appear on transcripts or in student files. Students may review their judicial records at any time. The right to appeal also exists, she added.
SUBJECT: Academic Misconduct

DATE: December 1, 1987

FROM: Myles Brand, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

TO: University Deans, Department Chairpersons, Faculty and Teaching Associates

On behalf of the Committee on Academic Misconduct, I want to remind the instructional staff to report all suspected cases of academic misconduct to the Committee. (See University Rule 3335-5-487) Composed of faculty and students, the Committee on Academic Misconduct establishes procedures for dealing with academic dishonesty, conducts hearings on charges of alleged misconduct, and imposes sanctions on those students found in violation of the Code of Student Conduct. Attached is a copy of the Procedures of the Committee on Academic Misconduct.

The Coordinator of the Committee, Professor W. Maurice Shipley (292-3478) and the Chairperson for the current academic year, Professor Mary K. Mitchell, will discuss the procedures with you should you wish clarification or assistance.

It is important to maintain confidentiality in cases of alleged academic misconduct. The instructor should confine his or her remarks exclusively to those individuals who must be informed. Talking about an alleged act of misconduct to anyone not directly involved in the case is not only unfair to the student, but it also violates the Family Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 which maintains that the privacy of the student must be maintained.
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Attachment
The Ohio State University

PROCEDURES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

1.0 The duty of this Committee is to investigate or establish procedures for the investigation of all reported cases of student academic misconduct (which term includes all forms of student academic misconduct wherever committed; illustrated by, but not limited to, cases of plagiarism and dishonest practices in connection with examinations) and to decide upon suitable disciplinary action. (See University Rule 3335-5-487)

1.1 The Committee does not have jurisdiction over cases involving student academic misconduct in professional colleges having a published honor code. These colleges follow their own codes in investigating reported cases of academic misconduct and in determining suitable disciplinary action. When the action taken involves suspension, dismissal, or entry on the student's permanent record, a recommendation to that effect shall be made to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost for review and action. In the course of following its own procedures, any professional college may consult with the Committee on Academic Misconduct. (See 3335-5-487)

1.2 The Committee may, at its discretion, refer cases to the University Judicial Panel if it determines that the alleged academic misconduct is incidental to some other misconduct. (See 3335-31-02 and 3335-31-03)

2.0 Academic misconduct is defined as any activity which tends to compromise the academic integrity of the institution, or subvert the educational process. Examples of academic misconduct include, but are not limited to:

1. violation of course rules as contained in the course syllabus or other information provided the student; violation of program regulations as established by departmental committees;

2. providing or receiving information during quizzes and examinations such as course examinations and general examinations; or providing or using unauthorized assistance in the laboratory, at the computer terminal, or on field work;
3. plagiarism, including the use of term papers or laboratory reports from any sources other than the student's own work;

4. falsification, fabrication, or dishonesty in reporting research results;

5. serving as, or enlisting the assistance of, a "ringer" or substitute for a student in the taking of examinations;

6. alteration of grades or marks by the student in an effort to change the earned grade or credit; and

7. alteration of University forms used to drop or add courses to a program, or unauthorized use of those forms. (3335-31-02)

3.0 All cases of suspected misconduct shall be reported to the Committee. The Committee also shall investigate cases of lax or irregular examination methods and report findings to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. Students have the obligation to report suspected misconduct or irregular or lax examination methods. The Committee may impose any Code sanction. (3335-31-02)

4.0 University Sanctions

4.1 General (3335-29-01)

Sanctions to be imposed upon students by the University are varied and may be imposed for violation of policies, rules, and regulations. When the sanctions are imposed, consideration will be given to individual mitigating circumstances as well as aggravating factors, such as, past misconduct by the student or failure of the student to fully comply with previous sanction conditions. Sanctions take effect immediately upon date of first notice, whether oral or written, unless otherwise specified within such notice.

4.2 Warning Admonition (3335-29-02)

A warning letter of admonition to a student represents a formal written statement for a specific conduct violation. Upon issuance of a formal letter of admonition, a discipline file is created in the Office of the Dean of Student Life. The file will be consulted in determining sanctions for any further proven Code violations at a future date.
4.3 Disciplinary Probation (3335-29-03)

Probation is a sanction that is given for a specified period of time. A discipline record is created in the Office of the Dean of Student Life. Misconduct during the probationary period may cause more serious disciplinary action to be taken. Written notice of probationary status is forwarded to the student's college. Conditions restricting the student's privileges or eligibility for activities may be imposed. Such privileges and eligibility are automatically restored upon completion of the probation period if the student has complied satisfactorily with all conditions and refrained from further Code violations.

4.4 Suspension and Dismissal (3335-29-04)

A. Suspension

Suspension is a sanction by which the student is involuntarily separated from the University for a period not to exceed three full academic quarters following the effective date specified in the sanction letter. Eligibility for re-enrollment is restored upon expiration of suspension.

B. Dismissal

Dismissal is a sanction by which the student is involuntarily separated from the University for four full quarters or more following the effective date specified in the sanction letter. Re-enrollment of the student at the University after dismissal is not guaranteed. The student must reapply for admission to the University.

C. Conditions of Suspension and Dismissal

1. A student who has been dismissed or suspended from the University:

   a. shall be denied all privileges accorded a student; and

   b. shall be required to leave campus at a time determined by the hearing panel.
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However, the dismissed or suspended student:

(i) may petition to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost for entrance to the campus for a specified purpose; and

(ii) has the right of appeal to remove or to reduce the terms of this condition. The appeal procedures will be specified in every sanction letter.

2. Upon reinstatement, a student may be required to meet certain other conditions imposed by the hearing body such as ineligibility to participate in specified student activities; or ineligibility to participate in intercollegiate events; or periodic contact with a designated University staff member or counseling agency, to the extent that such conditions pertain to the original offense.

Depending upon the merits of the individual case, and recommendation from the Coordinator of the Committee on Academic Misconduct, the Coordinator of Judicial Affairs, or the dean of the student's college, these conditions may be waived by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, or designee, at the time of the student's reinstatement.

4.5 Interim Suspension (3335-29-05)

When the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost is given reasonable cause to believe that a student has violated University rules and there is reasonable cause to believe that the student's presence on campus constitutes a clear danger to the University community or creates a substantial risk of injury to any person on University premises, the student may be immediately suspended from University premises. This temporary suspension is imposed pending the initiation of a full hearing without undue delay on the merits of the case in accordance with the rules of The Ohio State University. The student may request, in writing, an appeal of the interim suspension to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, within three working days of imposition of the suspension. An appeal hearing will be conducted without undue delay by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, or the Vice President's designee.
4.6 Restitution (3335-29-06)

Restitution is a sanction that requires the student to make reimbursement for damages to, destruction or misappropriation of University property or services, or the property of any person. This sanction may be ordered in lieu of or in connection with another sanction.

4.7 Other Sanctions (see 3335-27-07)

Other sanctions that the hearing panel deems appropriate to the student and the conduct violation in question may be imposed. For example, research assignments, community service projects, and special workshop participation can be assigned as recommended sanctions or as conditions to another sanction. In cases of academic misconduct, a failing grade may be recommended for the academic course work. Failure to meet requirements of any sanction in the time allotted or a repetition of misconduct may result in an extension of the period of sanction or imposition of a more severe sanction.

5.0 Notices of Proceedings (see 3335-27-03)

If a hearing is to be held, written notification will be delivered to the last known address of the student, either by certified mail, first class mail, or by hand-delivery, no fewer that seven calendar days prior to the hearing. The notification will include the charge, date, time, and location of the hearing, the hearing panel, a statement of the accused's rights, and information on the hearing procedures. The accused student may waive the notice period, request a postponement for reasonable cause, or request a hearing separate from other accused persons. Request for a postponement or separate hearing must be received by the Coordinator of the Committee at least one day before the scheduled hearing.

6.0 Hearing Procedures (see 3335-27-04)

Students have a right to fair hearings. Although the procedural requirements are not as formal as those existing in the civil courts of law, to ensure fairness, the following procedures apply and will be included within hearing notices:
A. Hearings are restricted to those directly involved or requested by the accused of hearing panel to attend. The hearing panel may take reasonable measures to assure an orderly hearing, including removal of persons who impede or disrupt proceedings.

B. The accused student may have a person present to advise him/her. The adviser may only counsel the student and not actively participate in the hearing, unless clarification is needed as determined by the hearing panel.

C. The accused may submit a written statement, may invite witnesses to attend on the accused's behalf, may ask questions of witnesses called by others, and will be notified of witnesses to be called. The University may present witnesses as well as question those presented by the accused.

D. Written statements signed by a witness, accepted and verified as that witness' statement by the Coordinator of the Committee, may be used if, for good reason, the witness cannot attend the hearing.

E. University hearings, unlike proceedings of courts of law, do not require conclusive proof; instead, the greater weight of the evidence is sufficient for the hearing panel to decide if a violation of the Code has occurred and to impose a sanction.

7.0 Attendance (3335-27-05)

Because the most accurate and fair review of the facts can best be accomplished when all parties are present, the accused is expected to attend. If an individual does not choose to attend a hearing, the charges will be reviewed as scheduled on the basis of the information available and a decision will be made. No decision shall be based solely on the failure of the accused student to attend the hearing or answer the charges.

8.0 Record and Nature of the Proceedings (see 3335-27-06)

A record consisting of written notes, tapes, or other method selected by the hearing panel will be made of all hearings. This record will be available to the accused, during the appeal period, and can be copied at his or her expense. A written notice of the decision and information regarding appeal procedures will be sent to the accused student. In general, materials relating to a disciplinary action are confidential and may be made available by the Coordinator of
the Committee only to those who have a valid need to know, e.g., discipline officers, Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, and other University officials who have a demonstrated need to know. The policy governing confidentiality and release of records is printed in the quarterly Master Schedule of Classes and available from the Office of Student Life.

9.0 Confidentiality and Release of Records

The Federal and State governments have both adopted legal requirements designed to protect the privacy of student educational records maintained by various University offices and to provide for the student's right to access the educational record. Generally, any information from the records may not be released to individuals outside the University community by the custodian of the records without permission of the individual whose record it is, and any individual has the right to see his or her own educational records. (see 3335-25-03)

10.0 Appeal (see 3335-27-07)

A student found to have violated the Code has the right to appeal the original decision. Appeals must be filed with the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost within fourteen calendar days from the date of the sanction decision letter. The following guidelines apply:

A. The grounds for appeal are procedural error, misapplication or misinterpretation of the rule alleged to be violated, findings of facts not supported by a greater weight of evidence, and discovery of substantial new facts that were unavailable at the time of hearing.

B. Barring introduction of substantial new facts, an appeal is limited to a review of the proceedings of the previous hearing.

C. An appeal based on grounds of procedural error, misapplication or misinterpretation of the rule alleged to be violated, or findings of facts not supported by a greater weight of evidence cannot result in a more severe sanction being imposed.

D. In requesting appeal where charges resulted in suspension or dismissal, a student is allowed active representation by an adviser.
E. A decision by a person designated to decide appeals, that there are substantial new facts that were unavailable at the time of the hearing, shall result in a new hearing by a different hearing panel. The determinations of this panel shall in no way be influenced or bound by the results of the original hearing.

11.0 Membership, Quorum, and Hearing Composition

11.1 The members of the Committee on Academic Misconduct include:

Fifteen (15) regular faculty members, with vote
Five (5) graduate students, with vote
Five (5) undergraduate students, with vote
Coordinator, without vote, who assists Committee with administrative matters but does not participate in the decisions of the Committee
Dean of Student Life, or designee, without vote

11.2 At least five members of the Committee shall constitute a hearing panel and a quorum sufficient to conduct a hearing and render a judgment in a case. The panel shall include at least three faculty members and two student members, with a majority of faculty members present.

If four members of the Committee are present, the accused will be given the option to proceed with the hearing and, if he/she elects to do so will waive any objection to the composition or quorum of the panel. If the accused elects not to proceed, it shall be without prejudice to the accused and this hearing will be rescheduled with the same or a different panel.

11.3 The accused student and his/her adviser (see 6.0 B) are entitled to be present at the hearing. In addition, the following individuals may be present during all or part of the hearing: those whose presence has been requested by the coordinator, witnesses, the person(s) who filed the report of alleged misconduct and/or departmental representative, and the secretary or designee of the student's college of enrollment. The University Ombudsman or designee, may be present as an observer, to participate in the hearing and deliberations, but without vote.
The hearing panel may call for, at its sole discretion, the separation of any witnesses for the hearing or ask any or all witnesses to leave the hearing at any time during the proceeding.

11.4 Chairperson

In the Spring, the Coordinator of the Committee shall appoint a chairperson pro tem from its continuing membership to serve during Summer quarter. The Committee shall elect its chairperson as its first meeting in Autumn quarter.

12.0 Suspected Academic Misconduct

12.1 Whenever academic misconduct by a student is suspected, the instructor should inform the student of the allegation. The presence of a colleague with the instructor at any subsequent meeting with the student is recommended.

12.2 Instructors should attempt to develop sufficient facts in the case to allow the case to be processed through the appropriate channels.

12.3 Students suspected of academic misconduct, whether acknowledging involvement or not, should be allowed to continue in the course without prejudice pending action by the Committee. If the course ends before the Committee has acted, the instructor should assign the student the grade of Imcomplete in accord with Rule 3335-7-21. The alternative grade for the Imcomplete should be that which would have been given if the student were to be found not in violation of the Code of Student Conduct.

12.4 The instructor shall prepare a written report on the alleged academic misconduct. The report should be as complete as possible, and should have all relevant evidence attached. Whenever possible, original documents, such as the alleged plagiarized paper, test, computer print-outs, etc., should be submitted and sources of plagiarized material should also be provided, with the passages plagiarized clearly marked.

12.5 The report prepared by the instructor will be reviewed by the chairperson of the academic unit and transmitted within three working days to the Coordinator of the Committee, 119 Independence Hall, 1923 Neil Avenue Mall. If possible, the report should be hand-carried and marked "Confidential."
12.6 The Coordinator, on behalf of the Committee, will notify the accused student(s) of the charge of Academic Misconduct.

13.0 Student Requests

13.1 A student charged with academic misconduct may review the case file prior to the hearing, and may request a copy of all pertinent information in the file before the hearing. The student may request to meet with the Coordinator to review student rights and responsibilities.

13.2 An accused student may request a continuance of the hearing for cause. The request for continuance must be received at least one day before the hearing. The Coordinator of the Committee will be responsible for reviewing such a request and will promptly inform the accused of the decision on the petition.

13.3 When more than one student is accused in an incident, one or more of the accused may petition for separate hearings. The request for a separate hearing must be received at least one day before the hearing. The Coordinator of the Committee will be responsible for reviewing such requests and promptly informing the accused of the decision on the petition.

13.4 Regional Campus and Agricultural Technical Institute students may request to have cases heard in Columbus or by an ad hoc panel at the regional campus/Agricultural Technical Institute.

With a request to be heard on a regional campus or ATI, the student waives the right to have the case heard by a panel of the Committee on Academic Misconduct in Columbus. The decision of the ad hoc panel is final, subject to the regular appeal procedures.
Composition of the ad hoc hearing panel off campus follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Membership</th>
<th>Source of Appointment to Subcommittee</th>
<th>Voting on Subcommittee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. regular COAM Member</td>
<td>Chairperson of COAM</td>
<td>voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ex-officio COAM representative for</td>
<td>Dean of Student Life</td>
<td>non-voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Judicial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. faculty member on regional campus/ATI</td>
<td>Dean or Director with concurrence of</td>
<td>voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COAM chairperson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. faculty member on regional campus/ATI</td>
<td>Dean or Director with concurrence of</td>
<td>voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COAM chairperson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. student on regional campus/ATI</td>
<td>Dean or Director with concurrence of</td>
<td>voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COAM chairperson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. student on regional campus/ATI</td>
<td>Dean or Director with concurrence of</td>
<td>voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>COAM chairperson</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Coordinator of COAM</td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>non-voting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The quorum requirements and the options of the students outlined in 11.2 apply.

14.0 Records of the Committee on Academic Misconduct

Records are considered confidential. Copies of sanction letters are sent only to those University officers with a valid need to know, such as the college secretary who is in charge of student records and the Office of Judicial Affairs. The Office of the University Registration is informed
Glance back finds cheating up at OSU

By Tim Doulin
Dispatch Staff Reporter

Cheating in the classroom apparently was up slightly at Ohio State University a year ago.

There were 135 violations of the code of student conduct from the beginning of summer quarter 1986 to the end of spring quarter 1987, according to OSU's Committee on Academic Misconduct. Those are the most recent statistics available.

From the summer of 1985 to the spring of 1986, there were 129 violations reported.

ONE REASON for the increase in reported violations is the fact that faculty members are checking more closely, said Maurice Shipley, coordinator of the academic misconduct committee.

"A lot of departments are concerned with the integrity of their unit," he said.

"There is a wave of that across the nation. They are trying to upgrade their departments, and they want students to adhere to rigid standards."

Today's students also know less about what is right and wrong when it comes to academic conduct, Shipley said.

"STUDENTS ARE coming into the university with less understanding of what misconduct is," Shipley said. "I think many students don't know what plagiarism is."

The committee heard 178 accusations during the 1986-87 report period of alleged academic misconduct involving 174 students. Four students were charged twice.

Students were found in violation of the conduct code in 76 percent of the cases. Students were cleared of wrongdoing in 43 cases, or 24 percent of the time.

Most frequent offenses were cheating on exams or quizzes (54), and plagiarism (36).

THERE WERE 23 violations involving collusion, collaboration, or cheating on labs or homework; eight cases of alteration of OSU administrative paper work; seven incidents of alteration of an exam and resubmitting it for regrading; six cases of a student taking a test for another student; and one violation involving falsifying data for a report.

Five cases were appealed.

The 25-member committee — which consists of 15 faculty members, five graduate students and five undergraduate students — granted one appeal and denied two.

Two appeals resulted in an order that the cases come before the committee again.

Freshmen committed 29 percent of the violations, sophomores 24 percent, juniors 20 percent, seniors 23 percent and graduate students 4 percent.

Punishment ranged from a letter of warning to dismissal from school for at least 1 year.

OF THE students in violation, 120 were placed on probation for between one and four quarters or until graduation; nine were suspended from school for between one and four quarters; three received letters of warning; and three received unspecified sanctions.

The committee takes into consideration the nature of the violation, the student's record and the circumstances surrounding the violation before deciding punishment.

"We don't want to destroy lives, but we want the students to be responsible for their actions," Shipley said.
Misconduct violations increase slightly
Rise linked to high integrity of departments

By Carmel Martin
Lantern staff writer

In the course of one year, the number of academic misconduct charges at Ohio State rose slightly, according to a report by the Committee on Academic Misconduct released earlier this month.

"(The number of violations) is up a bit, but I don't think we're anywhere near out-of-control," said Maurice Shipley, coordinator of the Committee on Academic Misconduct.

According to the report presented to the University Senate, 178 charges were alleged during the period from Summer Quarter 1986, to Spring Quarter 1987. During the same period a year earlier, there were 162 charges.

There was also a rise in the number of students found guilty during the period from 1986 to 1987. Students were found guilty of violating the Code of Student Conduct in 135 of these cases, compared to 129 guilty verdicts the prior year, according to the most current figures available.

Shipley said one factor of the increase "is that it has something to do with the faculty and departments being very concerned about the integrity of their classes and units respectively."

He also said a smaller percentage of students actually read the syllabus and understand the rules and regulations of the course.

"I think that it's also because a number of students have misconceptions about what constitutes plagiarism or cheating within the classroom or laboratory construct," he said.

John Senn, coordinator of the Committee on Academic Misconduct from June 1984 to June 1987, said he thinks some students cheat out of desperation when they should actually be talking to the instructor to find out how to do better in a course.

The committee that decides the ruling has 25 members. Faculty members elected by the Faculty Senate hold 15 of the seats, five undergraduates are chosen by the University Student Government, and five graduate students are chosen by the Council of Graduate Students.

The committee is divided into five-member panels charged with hearing a case.

When an instructor suspects a student of cheating, Shipley said, the instructor must first write a report on the circumstances surrounding the charge. Then the instructor meets with the student to notify the student of the charge. This meeting is observed by a third person.

After this meeting the instructor gives the report to the department chairman, who forwards it to the committee, he said.

The committee then notifies the student in a letter of what the student is being charged with and all pertinent information they have on the case, Shipley said.

"The student then goes to an interview before the committee, which informs the student of rights, rules and procedures of the hearing. The committee later notifies the student of the date and time of the hearing."

Shipley said it takes almost a quarter from the time the committee receives a case to the time of the hearing.

"The student goes to school during that quarter," he said, "because a student is innocent until proven guilty."

"You look at a wide variety of things when hearing a case," Shipley said. "And you try to render your best judgment given the charge."

"You can't just run students through a mill and say that everyone charged with plagiarism gets a certain penalty," he said.

"Most people think we only deal with plagiarism and cheating on exams, but we deal with a lot of other things, too," Shipley said.

He would not comment on the other types of violations.

The report to the University Senate, however, listed falsifying data for a report or paper, alteration of OSU administrative paper work, allowing a student to take a test, taking a test for someone else, and alteration of an exam and resubmitting it for regrading, as other types of academic misconduct.
OSU student violation policy under scrutiny

Finale was over and Julie was looking forward to going home for the summer. She had just turned in a paper that counted as her final in a class. She worked hard on the paper and was glad it was finally done.

Julie, not her real name, was packing her clothes when her professor called. He said her paper was very similar to a book he had read, and wanted her to come in to talk about it.

"I went to his office, and he told me that he suspected me of plagiarizing an author's ideas.

"Julie is an OSU student who was charged with academic misconduct. At her request her name was changed. She offered information to this story because she wanted other students to be aware of what happens to you if you are found in violation of plagiarism.

None of the information concerning charges obtained from any office or administrator at Ohio State. The university has strict confidentiality guidelines to protect the student.

"I couldn't believe it. I thought it was just words, not ideas that you could plagiarize," Julie said.

"I even included the source in the bibliography six times. The professor said I needed to have quotations marks in the seven times. I couldn't even point out the student code where it says ideas, not just words are considered plagiarism," she said.

Story by Susan Southard

"ASKED him if he would just consider my being charged. He said he was just missing the quotation marks. But he said no.

"I told him I was there, but I really didn't think he was going to turn me in to academic misconduct," she said. "I didn't bring witnesses, so they could have said anything they wanted about my reaction later."

"I told him it wasn't intentional. I don't need to steal. I am a good student, I had an A in the class before I turned in the paper.

"The professor knew I was a good student. I was the only person in the class who never missed a class," Julie said. "I asked him to just fail me on the paper, and average the grade in with my average."

Schuster turned her over to the committee on academic misconduct.

"When an instructor suspects you of cheating on an exam, he can't take you out of the exam," said Maurice Shiple, coordinator for Academic Misconduct. "The student has a right to finish his exam."

Gray Austin, university ombudsman, said some students who are suspected of cheating any they can't even know about it after the grades come out.

"If the instructor suspects cheating while grading the final, and is not able to get in touch with the student, the faculty member should turn in a grade of incomplete until after the hearing," Austin said.

IN PREPARATION for any hearing on academic misconduct, the Office of Judicial Affairs prepares information about the history of the student record, said Sandra Schuster, coordinator of Office of Judicial Affairs.

Records of all university violations such as cheating, plagiarism, and academic dishonesty, are gathered into one file for the case.

Information about previous violations handled by the committee to determine the appropriate sanction for the student if he is charged again, Schuster said.

This information is put inside of a sealed envelope, and is not opened until the panel determines whether the student is found in violation or not. Schuster said.

Past violations do not have any affect on the panel's determination, Schuster said.

Schuster said decisions are based on the evidence brought up against the student and how much that evidence supports the charges.

"The evidence must tip the scale for person to be found in violation," Schuster said.

If the student is not found in violation, the sealed envelope is destroyed without being opened, Schuster said.

Julie said the worst part of the ordeal was waiting for the hearing.

"I did not know what was going to happen to me," Julie said. "I was worried about how this would affect my future. I was allowed to bring one other person to the hearing.

Aubin said a tape is made of the hearing and the student as a right to ask for a copy.

JULIE'S HEARING began with the statement that she was suspected of being in violation of plagiarism.

"In defense, I told them I was a good writer and that I was the editor of a newspaper in high school," Julie said. "My papers are good and I do not need to cheat.

"I reminded them that the source was listed six times in my bibliography," she said.

"Then, they asked me to leave the room while the panel decided whether I was in violation or not," Julie said.

Aubin said, "There is almost never a coincidence when students turn in a lab report, or exam that are identical. It almost always means there has been a joint effort.

"If the student is found in violation, the committee is asked to talk about the student's history, grade point, and potential to the student," Aubin said.

Then, the sealed envelope is opened and the information inside helps the committee determine the most appropriate sanction.

"The second or third time the student has been violation, the sanctions will be more severe," Austin said.

"They gave me an F on the paper and three quarters of academic probation," Schuster said.

"After the hearing, I was very concerned about the tape. I was mailed a letter, and that after two weeks, the appeals process was over, a new grade had been taped over the old one," Julie said.

SHE RECEIVED a letter from Charles Corbato, associate provost administrator, stating the tapes were reviewed, and that later, Julie received a second letter from Corbato stating the tapes were reviewed, and that after two weeks, the appeals process was over, a new grade had been taped over the old one, Julie said.

"I received a letter from Charles Corbato, associate provost administrator, stating the tapes were reviewed, and that after two weeks, the appeals process was over, a new grade had been taped over the old one, Julie said.

"They gave me an F on the paper and three quarters of academic probation," Schuster said.

"After the hearing, I was very concerned about the tape. I was mailed a letter, and that after two weeks, the appeals process was over, a new grade had been taped over the old one, Julie said.

THE TAPES from the hearing go inside of every file, Shiple said.

"After the hearing, the files are sent to University Archives, and a card is sent to judicial affairs, regardless of whether the student was found in violation or not," Schuster said.

The tape, including the tapes, are sent to University Archives because the University must keep a record of the hearing, Shiple said.

"Raimund Goeller, of University Archives, said it is impossible for anyone to find out about the proceedings.

"The only people who can get information from here are the offices who sent it here in the first place," Goeller said. "We are performing a custodial service.

SCHUSTER said, "Even though the student is found in violation, we (judicial affairs) still receive a card on it, but never would the office tell anyone that the student was charged, but was not found in violation.

"The policy in judicial affairs only lists the student code number of the violation. It does not describe any details of violation, and Schuster says that can hurt you.

"If you throw a water balloon, it will be called destruction of property," she said.

The law requires the University keep this information for a minimum of three years, Schuster said.

"But, Ohio State keeps it forever," she said. "We don't have a records expungement policy that would allow us to destroy any records," Schuster said.

The information is kept from the public, unless a person signs a waiver of confidentiality. Some graduate and professional schools require students to sign a waiver to get accepted.

"If the student signs the waiver, then we would be required to tell them the violation code number and the sanction.

"Other schools have an expungement relief," she said.

Expungements allow students' records to be destroyed after a minimum of three years.

"Ohio State has begun the discussions for an expungement policy," Schuster said.

The guidelines for the policy are ready to be revised by professors and administrators. From there, it will be debated by the University Senate, Schuster said.

IT COULD BE a year before the policy goes into effect, Schuster said. In the meantime, students concerned about how information in their records affect an organization's decisions about him/her, check before applying to see whether or not that organization requires a signed waiver.

"Look at what is being asked on the waiver. Know what you are signing," Schuster said.

Julie's hearing and decision has affected her future studies.

"I was refused by many graduate schools. I graduated with honors, but my grades were good enough, so the information in judicial affairs probably did hurt me," Julie said.
DATE: September 15, 1989

FROM: Dr. Frederick Hutchinson, Acting Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

TO: University Deans, Department Chairpersons, Faculty and Teaching Associates

RE: Academic Misconduct

On behalf of the Committee on Academic Misconduct, I want to remind the instructional staff to report all suspected cases of academic misconduct to the Committee. (See University Rule 3335-5-487.) Composed of faculty and students, the Committee on Academic Misconduct establishes procedures for dealing with academic dishonesty, conducts hearings on charges of alleged misconduct, and imposes sanctions on those students found in violation of the Code of Student Conduct. Attached is a copy of the Procedures of the Committee on Academic Misconduct.

The Coordinator of the Committee, Professor W. Maurice Shipley (292-7262) will discuss the procedures with you should you wish clarification or assistance.

It is important to maintain confidentiality in cases of alleged academic misconduct. The instructor should confine his or her remarks exclusively to those individuals who must be informed. Talking about an alleged act of misconduct to anyone not directly involved in the case is not only unfair to the student, but it also violates the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 which maintains that the privacy of the student must be maintained.

ths

Attachment
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

PROCEDURES OF THE COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

1.0 A duty of this Committee is to investigate or establish procedures for the investigation of all reported cases of student academic misconduct and to decide upon suitable disciplinary action. (See University Rule 3335-5-487)

1.1 The Committee does not have jurisdiction over cases involving student academic misconduct in professional colleges having a published honor code. These colleges follow their own codes in investigating reported cases of academic misconduct and in determining suitable disciplinary action. When the action taken involves suspension, dismissal, or entry on the student’s permanent record, a recommendation to that effect shall be made to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost for review and action. In the course of following its own procedures, any professional college may consult with the Committee on Academic Misconduct. (See 3335-5-487)

1.2 The Committee may, at its discretion, refer cases to the University Judicial Panel if it determines that the alleged academic misconduct is incidental to some other misconduct. (See 3335-31-02 and 3335-31-03)

2.0 Academic misconduct is defined as any activity which tends to compromise the academic integrity of the institution, or subvert the educational process. Examples of academic misconduct include, but are not limited to:

A. violation of course rules as contained in the course syllabus or other information provided the student; violation of program regulations as established by departmental committees;

B. providing or receiving information during quizzes and examinations such as course examinations and general examinations; or providing or using unauthorized assistance in the laboratory, at the computer terminal, or on field work;

C. submitting plagiarized work for an academic requirement. Plagiarism is the representation of another’s works or ideas as one’s own; it includes the unacknowledged word for word use and/or paraphrasing of another person’s work, and/or the inappropriate unacknowledged use of another person’s ideas;

D. falsification, fabrication, or dishonesty in reporting research results;

E. serving as, or enlisting the assistance of, a "ringer" or substitute for a student in the taking of examinations;

F. alteration of grades or marks by the student in an effort to change the earned grade or credit; and

G. alteration of University forms used to drop or add courses to a program, or unauthorized use of those forms. (3335-31-02)

3.0 All cases of suspected misconduct shall be reported to the Committee. The Committee also shall investigate cases of lax or irregular examination methods and report findings to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost. Students have the obligation to report suspected misconduct or irregular or lax examination methods. The Committee may impose any Code sanction. (3335-31-02)

4.0 University Sanctions

4.1 General (3335-29-01)

Sanctions to be imposed upon students by the University are varied and may be
imposed for violation of policies, rules, and regulations. When the sanctions are imposed, consideration will be given to individual mitigating circumstances as well as aggravating factors, such as, past misconduct by the student or failure of the student to fully comply with previous sanction conditions. Sanctions take effect immediately upon date of first notice, whether oral or written, unless otherwise specified within such notice.

4.2 Warning Admonition (3335-29-02)

A warning letter of admonition to a student represents a formal written statement for a specific conduct violation. Upon issuance of a formal letter of admonition, a discipline file is created in the Office of the Dean of Student Life. The file will be consulted in determining sanctions for any further proven Code violations at a future date.

4.3 Disciplinary Probation (3335-29-03)

Probation is a sanction that is given for a specified period of time. A discipline record is created in the Office of the Dean of Student Life. Misconduct during the probationary period may cause more serious disciplinary action to be taken. Written notice of probationary status is forwarded to the student’s college. Conditions restricting the student’s privileges or eligibility for activities may be imposed. Such privileges and eligibility are automatically restored upon completion of the probation period if the student has complied satisfactorily with all conditions and refrained from further Code violations.

4.4 Suspension and Dismissal (3335-29-04)

A. Suspension

Suspension is a sanction by which the student is involuntarily separated from the University for a period not to exceed three full academic quarters following the effective date specified in the sanction letter. Eligibility for reinstatement is restored upon expiration of suspension.

B. Dismissal

Dismissal is a sanction by which the student is involuntarily separated from the University for four full quarters or more following the effective date specified in the sanction letter. The dismissed student must apply for reinstatement. Reinstatement of the student at the University after dismissal is not guaranteed.

C. Conditions of Suspension and Dismissal

1. A student who has been dismissed or suspended from the University:

   a. shall be denied all privileges accorded a student; and

   b. shall be required to leave campus at a time determined by the hearing panel.

   However, the dismissed or suspended student:

   (i) may petition to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost for entrance to the campus for a specified purpose; and

   (ii) has the right of appeal to remove or to reduce the terms of this condition. The appeal procedures will be specified in every sanction letter.
2. Upon reinstatement, a student may be required to meet certain other conditions imposed by the hearing body such as ineligibility to participate in specified student activities; or ineligibility to participate in intercollegiate events; or periodic contact with a designated University staff member or counseling agency, to the extent that such conditions pertain to the original offense.

Depending upon the merits of the individual case, and recommendation from the Coordinator of the Committee on Academic Misconduct, the Coordinator of Judicial Affairs, or the dean of the student's college, these conditions may be waived by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, or designee, at the time of the student's reinstatement.

4.5 Interim Suspension (3335-29-05)

When the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost is given reasonable cause to believe that a student has violated University rules and there is reasonable cause to believe that the student's presence on campus constitutes a clear danger to the University community or creates a substantial risk of injury to any person on University premises, the student may be immediately suspended from the University premises. This temporary suspension is imposed pending the initiation of a full hearing without undue delay on the merits of the case in accordance with the rules of The Ohio State University. The student may request, in writing, an appeal of the interim suspension to the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, within three working days of imposition of the suspension. An appeal hearing will be conducted without undue delay by the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, or the Vice President's designee.

4.6 Restitution (3335-29-06)

Restitution is a sanction that requires the student to make reimbursement for damages to, destruction or misappropriation of University property or services, or the property of any person. This sanction may be ordered in lieu of or in connection with another sanction.

4.7 Other Sanctions (see 3335-29-07)

Other sanctions that the hearing panel considers appropriate to the student and the conduct violation in question may be imposed. For example, research assignments, community service projects, special workshop participation, and/or referral to medical resources or counseling personnel may be assigned as recommended sanctions or as conditions to another sanction. In cases of academic misconduct, a lowered or failing grade may be recommended for the academic course work. Failure to meet requirements of any sanction in the time allotted or a repetition of misconduct may result in an extension of the period of sanction or imposition of a more severe sanction.

5.0 Notices of Proceedings (see 3335-27-03)

If a hearing is to be held, written notification will be delivered to the last known address of the student, either by certified mail, first class mail, or by hand-delivery, no fewer than seven calendar days prior to the hearing. The notification will include the charge and the date, time, and location of the hearing, the hearing panel, a statement of the accused's rights, and information on the hearing procedures. The accused student may waive the notice period, request a postponement for reasonable cause, or request a hearing separate from other accused persons. Request for a postponement or separate hearing must be received by the Coordinator of the Committee at least one day before the scheduled hearing.
6.0 Hearing Procedures (see 3335-27-04)

Students have a right to fair hearings. Although the procedural requirements are not as formal as those existing in the civil courts of law, to ensure fairness, the following procedures apply and will be included within hearing notices:

A. Hearings are restricted to those directly involved or those requested by the accused or hearing panel to attend. The hearing panel may take reasonable measures to assure an orderly hearing, including removal of persons who impede or disrupt proceedings.

B. The accused student may have a person present to advise him or her. The adviser may only counsel the student and not actively participate in the hearing, unless clarification is needed as determined by the hearing panel.

C. The accused may submit a written statement, may invite witnesses to attend on the accused’s behalf, may ask questions of witnesses called by others, and will be notified of witnesses to be called. The University may present witnesses as well as question those presented by the accused.

D. Written statements signed by a witness(es), accepted and verified as being by that witness(es) by the Coordinator of the Committee, may be used if, for good reason, the witness(es) cannot attend the hearing.

E. University hearings, unlike proceedings of courts of law, do not require conclusive proof; instead, the greater weight of the evidence is sufficient for the hearing panel to decide if a violation of the Code has occurred and to impose a sanction.

7.0 Attendance (3335-27-05)

Because the most accurate and fair review of the facts can best be accomplished when all parties are present, the accused is expected to attend. If an individual does not choose to attend a hearing, the charges will be reviewed as scheduled on the basis of the information available and a decision will be made. No decision shall be based solely on the failure of the accused student to attend the hearing or answer the charges.

8.0 Record and Nature of the Proceedings (see 3335-27-06)

A record consisting of written notes, tapes, or other method selected by the hearing panel will be made of all hearings. This record will be available to the accused, during the appeal period, and can be copied at his or her expense. A written notice of the decision and information regarding appeal procedures will be sent to the accused student. In general, materials relating to a disciplinary action are confidential and may be made available by the Coordinator of the Committee only to those who have a valid need to know, e.g., disciplinary officers, the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost, and other University officials who have a demonstrated need to know.

9.0 Confidentiality and Release of Records

The Federal and State governments have both adopted legal requirements designed to protect the privacy of student educational records maintained by various University offices and to provide for the student’s right to access the educational record. Generally, any information from the records may not be released to individuals outside the University community by the custodian of the records without permission of the individual whose record it is, and any individual has the right to see his or her own educational records. (See 3335-25-03)

10.0 Appeal (see 3335-27-07)

A student found to have violated the Code has the right to appeal the original decision. Appeals must be filed with the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost within fourteen calendar days from the date of the sanction decision letter. The following guidelines apply:
A. The grounds for appeal are procedural error, misapplication or misinterpretation of the rule alleged to be violated, findings of facts not supported by a greater weight of evidence, and discovery of substantial new facts that were unavailable at the time of hearing.

B. Barring introduction of substantial new facts, an appeal is limited to a review of the proceedings of the previous hearing.

C. An appeal based on grounds of procedural error, misapplication or misinterpretation of the rule alleged to be violated, or findings of facts not supported by a greater weight of evidence cannot result in a more severe sanction being imposed.

D. A student is allowed active representation by an advisor when making an appeal of proceedings which resulted in suspension or dismissal.

E. A new hearing by a different hearing panel shall result when the Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost determines that there are substantial new facts that were unavailable at the time of the hearing. The determination of this panel shall in no way be influenced or bound by the result of the original hearing.

11.0 Membership, Quorum, and Hearing Composition

11.1 The members of the Committee on Academic Misconduct include:

Fifteen (15) regular faculty members, with vote;
Five (5) graduate students, with vote;
Five (5) undergraduate students, with vote;
Coordinator, without vote, who assists the Committee with administrative matters but does not participate in the decisions of the Committee; and the Dean of Student Life, or designee, without vote.

11.2 At least five members of the Committee shall constitute a hearing panel and a quorum sufficient to conduct a hearing and render a judgment in a case. The panel shall include at least three faculty members and two student members, with a majority of faculty members present.

If four members of the Committee are present, the accused will be given the option to proceed with the hearing and, if he or she elects to do so, will waive any objection to the composition or quorum of the panel. If the accused elects not to proceed, it shall be without prejudice to the accused and this hearing will be rescheduled with the same or a different panel.

11.3 The accused student and his or her advisor (see 6.0 B) are entitled to be present at the hearing. In addition, the following individuals may be present during all or part of the hearing: those whose presence has been requested by the coordinator, witnesses, the person(s) who filed the report of alleged misconduct and/or departmental representative, and the secretary or designee of the student’s college of enrollment. The University Ombudsman or designee may be present as an observer, to participate in the hearing and deliberations, but without vote.

The hearing panel may call for, at its sole discretion, the separation of any witnesses for the hearing or ask any or all witnesses to leave the hearing at any time during the proceeding.

11.4 Chairperson

In the Spring of each year, the Coordinator of the Committee shall appoint a chairperson pro tem from its continuing membership to serve during Summer quarter. The Committee shall elect its chairperson at its first meeting in Autumn quarter.
12.0 Suspected Academic Misconduct

12.1 Whenever academic misconduct by a student is suspected, the instructor should inform the student of the allegation. The presence of a colleague with the instructor at any subsequent meeting with the student is recommended.

12.2 Instructors should attempt to develop sufficient facts in the case to allow the case to be processed through the appropriate channels.

12.3 Students suspected of academic misconduct, whether acknowledging involvement or not, should be allowed to continue in the course without prejudice pending action by the Committee. If the course ends before the Committee has acted, the instructor should assign the student the grade of Incomplete in accord with Rule 3335-7-21. The alternative grade for the Incomplete should be that which will be given if the student is not found in violation of the Code of Student Conduct.

12.4 The instructor shall prepare a written report on the alleged academic misconduct. The report should be as complete as possible, and should have all relevant evidence attached. Whenever possible, original documents, such as the alleged plagiarized paper, test, computer print-outs, etc., should be submitted and sources of plagiarized material should also be provided, with the passages plagiarized clearly marked.

12.5 The report prepared by the instructor will be reviewed by the chairperson of the academic unit and transmitted within three working days to the Coordinator of the Committee, 1110 Lincoln Tower, 1800 Cannon Drive. If possible, the report should be hand-carried and marked "Confidential."

12.6 The Coordinator, on behalf of the Committee, will notify the accused student(s) of the charge of Academic Misconduct.

13.0 Student Requests

13.1 A student charged with academic misconduct may review the case file prior to the hearing, and may request a copy of all pertinent information in the file before the hearing. The student may request to meet with the Coordinator to review student rights and responsibilities.

13.2 An accused student may request a continuance of the hearing for cause. The request for continuance must be received at least one day before the hearing. The Coordinator of the Committee will be responsible for reviewing such a request and will promptly inform the accused of the decision on the request.

13.3 When more than one student is accused in an incident, one or more of the accused may request separate hearings. The request for a separate hearing must be received at least one day before the hearing. The Coordinator of the Committee will be responsible for reviewing such requests and promptly informing the accused of the decision on the request.

13.4 Regional Campus and Agricultural Technical Institute students may request to have cases heard in Columbus or by an ad hoc panel at the regional campus/Agricultural Technical Institute.

With a request to be heard on a regional campus or ATI, the student waives the right to have the case heard by a panel of the Committee on Academic Misconduct in Columbus. The decision of the ad hoc panel is final, subject to the regular appeal procedures.
Composition of the ad hoc hearing panel off campus follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committee Membership</th>
<th>Source of Appointment</th>
<th>Voting or Non-Voting on Subcommittee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. regular COAM Member</td>
<td>Chairperson of COAM</td>
<td>voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ex-officio COAM representative for Student Judicial</td>
<td>Dean of Student Life</td>
<td>non-voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. faculty member on regional campus/ATI</td>
<td>Dean or Director with concurrence of COAM chairperson</td>
<td>voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. faculty member on regional campus/ATI</td>
<td>Dean or Director with concurrence of COAM chairperson</td>
<td>voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. student on regional campus/ATI</td>
<td>Dean or Director with concurrence of COAM chairperson</td>
<td>voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. student on regional campus/ATI</td>
<td>Dean or Director with concurrence of COAM chairperson</td>
<td>voting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Coordinator of COAM</td>
<td>Provost</td>
<td>non-voting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The quorum requirements and the options of the students outlined in 11.2 apply.

14.0 Records of the Committee on Academic Misconduct

Records are considered confidential. Copies of sanction letters are sent only to those University officers with a valid need to know, such as the College Secretary, who is in charge of student records, and the Office of Judicial Affairs. The Office of the University Registrar is informed when the sanction imposed is suspension or dismissal.

Effective: September 1, 1989
New technology one more way students can cheat

Competition, quarter system cited as possible causes

By Linda Loescher
Lantern staff writer

Cheating remains a problem at Ohio State primarily because of new technology and the never ending competition of getting into college and staying there, said Maurice Shipley, coordinator of academic misconduct.

The new programmable calculators can store formulas that can be used during a test, so it makes it hard for teachers to catch students cheating, Shipley said.

Another problem he encounters is students having increased competition.

“It’s tougher to get into a university and tougher still to get into their discipline,” he said.

Since competition has become stronger on campuses, the faculties have to make courses tougher for students. This causes some students to feel pressured and sometimes they cheat a little to help themselves through their course load, Shipley said.

“I also think that the quarter system doesn’t help it. I think it exacerbates it,” he said. “I think the semester system is a better system.”

The problem with the quarter system is that the first two weeks are spent getting used to the topic and teacher and getting books for the course, Shipley said. The last week is then used for finals, leaving the students only about seven good weeks of class to learn what they should in ten.

Patricia Williams, assistant ombudswoman said her office sits on the committee during the hearings when a student is charged with academic misconduct.

“One of the concerns I have is to do with the students not recognizing what the boundaries are relative to the academic misconduct,” Williams said.

Many students don’t understand what they have done is wrong, Williams said. “I see more confused people than people who are deliberately trying to circumvent the system.”

Many students are caught in a circle of circumstances which may lead to cheating: “It’s easy to make a little money,” Williams said. They may have two tests on the same day, they may be working too many hours, they may have just broken up with a boyfriend/girlfriend or they may just be taking too many classes.

Williams said if a teacher suspects a student is cheating, the teacher must forward the case through the Office of Academic Affairs.

“I think it’s hard to gauge whether it is happening more or whether there is more attention paid to the kinds of questionable behaviors that might lead to misconduct and are being brought forward,” Williams said.

She said there is a range of sanctions including disciplinary probation, extra assignments, failure of the course, lab or assignment or dismissal from school.

James Tootle, assistant dean of the Colleges of The Arts and Sciences, said he doesn’t feel cheating has increased, but he does believe it is a continuing problem.

Tootle hasn’t become involved until the hearing, but he is still a non-voting member. If a student is found in violation of the code, then he becomes involved by finding out about the student’s background to decide the type of sanction.

“There’s just a million different ways that a student can get himself into trouble,” Tootle said. This can include having a ringer take a test, stealing an exam, looking onto someone’s paper or getting unauthorized help by another student.

“Most of the students I see down here . . . they’re normal everyday, even kind - of good students. This is just something that befalls students below a two point or on probation or barely hanging onto their college career,” Tootle said.

He said most are good students, but they just slip once because of the competition of school and their classes.

Steven Fink, associate professor of English, said, “Anytime you catch a student plagiarizing and take it through academic misconduct, I think it is safe to assume that it is only the tip of the iceberg.”

He said the cases that are brought to the attention of the office are only a small percentage of the people who plagiarize. Without documented evidence it’s hard to prove if a student has plagiarized and the case won’t go anywhere.

Mark Layman, a sophomore from Pepper Pike, said, “I cheated once, not because it was detrimental to my grade, but because I didn’t know the material at all; therefore, I cheated.”
Cheating still commonplace

By Derrick Johnson
Lantern staff writer

A Miami University research project in Oxford, Ohio found that plagiarism is routine on college campuses despite the fact that most students consider the practice dishonest and wrong.

Jerold L. Hale, assistant professor of communications at Miami conducted the study.

"Plagiarism happens a lot," Hale said. "I had no idea it would be as commonplace as it appears to be."

Plagiarism is one of many forms of cheating.

According to OSU Professor Maurice Shipley, coordinator of the Committee on Academic Misconduct, cheating is a common occurrence at Ohio State.

"Cheating is not indigenous to Ohio State. It goes on across the country," Shipley said.

Approximately two hearings are held weekly to address alleged academic violations by students. Shipley thinks there is enough cheating going on at Ohio State to warrant more meetings.

Carol Bininger, the committee chair, said there is never any situation that should justify or warrant cheating.

"What we see is the tip of the iceberg," Bininger said. "There is a lot of cheating that takes place that does not come to our attention."

The duty of this committee is to investigate or establish procedures for investigation of all reported cases of students' academic misconduct and to decide upon suitable action.

Examples of academic misconduct or cheating include submitting plagiarized work for an academic requirement; providing or receiving information during quizzes and examinations; and serving as, or enlisting the assistance of, a "ringer" or substitute to receive better grades.

John Metzger, an undergraduate student representative on the committee, said he is not sure he is qualified to be part of the judge and jury of his peers.

"Being a student myself, I understand the pressures students have and I would not want to see a student get kicked out of school," Metzger said.

Bernard Rosen, an OSU professor of philosophy, said he thinks cheating is quite common.

"Cheating is not indigenous to Ohio State. It goes on across the country."

— Maurice Shipley

I'm a lot more honest than most college students."

The members of the Committee on Academic Misconduct include: 15 regular faculty members; five graduate students; five undergraduate students; all with voting power. The Dean of Student Life and the coordinator do not participate in decisions of the committee.

Shipley said he doesn't care whether or not students have cheated before appearing in front of the committee.

He said he is more concerned with students being treated honestly and fairly and with respect during the process. He said he is also concerned about students having enough time to plead their case as well as they can.

The University of California at Los Angeles, in a project with the American Council on Education, recently released the results of a study similar to Hale's.

The study, which sampled 200,000 students, found a little more than 30 percent of the students plagiarized work in the last year.

"The problem is that people don't see it (plagiarism and other forms of cheating) as a problem, so nobody has done anything to remedy it," Hale said.
Cheaters never win, academic report says

By EJ Johnson
Landmark writer

One hundred forty-nine OSU students were found guilty of academic misconduct from July 1989 through June 1990, according to the latest annual report of the Committee on Academic Misconduct. The report will be presented to the University Senate in April.

The Committee on Academic Misconduct, chaired by Charles Drummond, stated in its report that the two most alarming trends are the increased number of misconduct cases involving more than one student, and a trend of student workers who have been caught altering grade sheets and exams.

The report stated that the majority of students found guilty of misconduct received disciplinary probation for one to seven quarters. Twenty students were suspended from Ohio State for one to three quarters; and two were dismissed for a period of one to five years. In 128 cases, the committee recommended the student be given a failing or unsatisfactory grade.

The committee's voting members are comprised of 10 regular faculty members, five graduate students and five undergraduate students. Also present is the dean of Student Life or designee and the committee coordinator who briefs the accused student on committee procedures.

A student who was brought to the committee said the experience was "intimidating." The student admitted to blatantly plagiarizing a paper for a 100-level class by copying another student's notes.

"I sat at the end of a long table with 20 people looking at me and a microphone in my face," the student said. "They asked me questions and then told me to wait outside the room. Ten minutes later they called me back in and told me I was found guilty of plagiarism."

The student was given an "E" for the class, and was put on academic probation for three quarters.

The student, however, used her freshman for-
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Academic Misconduct Breakdown

By Class

- 35 freshmen
- 4 grad students
- 15 seniors
- 24 juniors
- 14 sophomores

By Penalty

- 3 letters of warning
- 2 dismissed
- 20 suspended
- 124 received disciplinary probation

SOURCE: Committee on Academic Affairs

Graphic by Thom Brainard/Lantern

My main concern was the possibility of getting kicked out of school," the student said. "I went through two weeks of sleepless nights. I was so relieved to get an 'E.'"

Betty Jo Hudson, the university ombudsman, said a representative from the Ombudsman Office is involved in the process to serve as a counselor for students. Hudson said her best advice to an accused student is to not get into a double bind by lying to parents.

Hudson said the severity of the penalty often reflects the academic history of the student. Graduate students and students who have been convicted of cheating will usually suffer greater than first-time offenders.

Of the students accused last year, 35 percent were freshmen. 14 percent were sophomores, 24 percent were juniors, 19 percent were seniors and 4 percent were graduate students.

Since the beginning of the summer quarter 1990 to Feb. 8, this year, the Committee on Academic Misconduct has heard 103 cases. The committee will not release complete information on the cases until a report can be made at a later time.
Cheating soars at Ohio State

By Melissa K. Sterrett
Lantern staff writer

By July 1, when the Committee on Academic Misconduct makes its annual report to the provost, the caseload from cheating at Ohio State will have increased by about 35 percent, the committee’s coordinator said.

Maurice Shipley, coordinator of the Committee on Academic Misconduct, said there has been a steady increase each of the six years he has been here, but never this big of a jump.

Shipley said the cases involve many forms of cheating. The committee’s annual report to the University Senate, made in March, cited plagiarism, cheating on exams and quizzes as the most frequent offenses.

The committee has considered numerous ideas, such as publishing numbers of cases and sanctions imposed without names, to reduce the number of misconduct cases, Shipley said.

But Shipley said he feared if cases were published, people would be encouraged by seeing that some cheating isn’t caught.

The Senate passed a resolution Saturday to expand the number of faculty and student panel members able to hear the cases.

The resolution will allow students to continue to serve on the committee for three years after being appointed.

It was necessary to reduce the backlog of cases and ensure that students receive a hearing in a timely fashion, Shipley said.

Charles Drummond, chairman of the committee, said the increase in cases could be attributed to more awareness by faculty and graduate students who are teaching courses, and increased competitiveness.

“Facility and graduate students are more aware of the procedure and more willing to bring (cases) forward,” Drummond said.

Shipley said that among the possible reasons for the increase, is a more sensitive, more conscious faculty.

“T.A.’s are sensitive to the issue of cheating. That’s admirable,” Shipley said.

Across the country, schools are becoming more competitive, and added pressure is on students to distinguish themselves by grades, Shipley said. “This is something we must be very concerned about,” Shipley said.

Drummond cited a case where more than 70 students in one class at Massachusetts Institute of Technology were caught cheating.

Although Shipley said he thinks Ohio State is doing the right thing by raising academic standards, he said it must be considered that it will bring grade-conscious students.

Shipley said it is a question of, “How do you separate yourself from other people? By being little bit better.”

But, Shipley said, “There is no question that, by and large, the real majority of students at Ohio State are serious students who work hard for what they get.”

This year, Shipley said he had been invited to talk to seven different departments, to better educate them on the procedures of the committee.

Shipley said he gets about five or six calls daily about the rules.

The procedures of the committee state that an instructor is obligated to bring the misconduct suspicion forward, to the committee. Students are given notice of the offense, and a hearing is set.

A case is heard by a quorum panel of three faculty members and two students. After deciding guilt or innocence, the committee may impose a wide range of sanctions, Shipley said.

“We can be very creative,” Shipley said. The sanctions range from a letter of warning and admonition – “a slap on the wrist,” Shipley said - to dismissal from the university.

“Students have to realize how serious it is. One time of yielding to temp-
Classroom fraud

A report by the Committee on Academic Misconduct sheds light on who’s cheating and what consequences swindlers face

By Gemma McLuckie

Karen Alexander Higgins was scared. The professor of her human ecology class had accused her and another woman of handing in identical research papers. “I knew the paper was mine because my husband had dropped my paper off in the professor’s mailbox five days before the other student handed in her paper. But there were two copies — one with my name and one with hers,” recalls Higgins, who graduated spring quarter 1991 with a bachelor’s degree in home economics education.

“I just couldn’t believe it. My education was on the line, my chance for a career.”

The professor reported Higgins and the other student to the Committee on Academic Misconduct.

“I cried for days,” Higgins says. The calm, caring attitude of W. Maurice Shipley, coordinator of the committee, during pre-hearing interviews helped her prepare a defense, she says.

For her hearing, Higgins came loaded with evidence of her research for the paper. The panel ruled in her favor.

Each year, faculty and teaching assistants report more and more such situations to the Committee on Academic Misconduct.

In 1989-90, its members heard 179 cases involving 185 students. In 1990-91, there were 268 cases involving 368 charges, reports Shipley, who is assistant professor of Black studies.

With such a demand, backlogs are a way of life, Shipley says. In 1987, his position as coordinator was a 35 percent appointment. Accused students waited a year to have their day in court.

Now, the coordinator post is a 75 percent appointment. But still, Shipley battles with time constraints. Already, he says, “I probably have enough cases for the quarter.”

By the time Mary C. “Kay” Mitchell, assistant professor of human nutrition and food management and the committee’s 1991-92 chairperson, makes a report to the University Senate on Dec. 7, the scheduling situation may have improved.

In order to deal with the delays, the University Senate and the Board of Trustees have approved increasing the misconduct committee membership from 27 to 34. There are now 18 faculty, seven graduate students and seven undergraduate students serving.

And if the larger committee still is not able to schedule hearings within a quarter, the committee chairperson in consultation with the coordinator is authorized to call on alternates.

It is one of only larger numbers of cases that create problems. The number of more complicated situations, most involving graduate students, has risen.

In 1989-90, only 4 percent of the 185 students under scrutiny were post-baccalaureate. In 1990-91, the percentage rose sharply, Shipley notes.

When graduate students are accused, hearing testimony takes longer. Panels spend more time determining cases because the consequences are usually severe, Shipley says.

Seeking outside help on exams, plagiarizing, giving or getting aid, collaborating, altering tests or University paperwork — these were the most common charges in 1989-90.

A March 1991 report from the committee to the University Senate noted:

“...of great concern are (cases) involving student workers who handle grade sheets, grade change forms, examinations and other office materials. It seems that for some students the temptation to alter or copy these materials is too great.”

Penalties for academic misconduct range from dismissal to general sanctions, such as participation in research assignments or community service projects.

Every college has to deal with academic misconduct, the report also pointed out.

In fact, nine colleges recently asked Shipley to talk with faculty about misconduct, what to look for and how to handle it.

This may have contributed to the larger case load, he says. “I demystified the process for faculty,” some of whom thought students were instantly thrown out of school if accused. “That’s not the case,” Shipley adds.

It seems also that teaching assistants are sensitive to cheating as “an assault on the integrity of the degree,” Shipley theorizes.

“Cheating occurs roughly equally throughout the undergraduate years,” the March report noted. And it’s not only students with low grade point averages who stray.

“The fact of the matter is, (as) we bring more grade-conscious students to the University, when some of them get into trouble in a class they may find it easier to cheat (than to accept a lower grade),” Shipley says.

In addition, “alarming trend is that the number of cases involving more than one student is increasing,” the committee wrote.

People tend not to blow the whistle, new study says

By Jeff Grabmeier

If you’re like most people, you have no doubt when you see dishonesty. But would you report such wrongdoing if you saw it happen? New research at Ohio State suggests most people wouldn’t.

In a published study involving 295 college business students, only about one-third reported apparent wrongdoing by a research assistant, even though they were given the opportunity to disclose it to a university official.

“Most students chose to ignore the fraud, although they could have reported it without identifying themselves,” says study co-author Marcia Miceli, associate professor of management and human resources.

“One conclusion from our study is that if scientists and subjects are unlikely to report concerns, wrongdoing and its consequences may continue.”

The study found significant differences between the sexes: Only 24 percent of the women reported the wrongdoing, compared to 38 percent of the men.

Thefts of retaliation had no effect on whistle-blowing, and subjects were more likely to report the fraud when they were in larger groups.

Miceli conducted the research with Janet Near of Indiana University and Janelle Dozier of the University of Houston.

The findings were published in the Feb. 16 issue of the Journal of Applied Social Psychology.

The study takes on added significance now, Miceli says, in light of the attention given to the scientific fraud case involving Nobel laureate David Baltimore. The National Institutes of Health recently released a report praising Margot O’Toole, a junior scientist who exposed fabricated data in a research paper co-authored by Baltimore.

“Our findings suggest that O’Toole’s response was not the most likely,” Miceli says. “In cases like this, it may be much more common to ignore the fraud than to report it.”

In the current study, the subjects were told they were participating in a study of managerial decision-making. They were asked to assume the role of a manager and decide which of three applicants was best qualified for a job. One applicant was clearly more qualified, according to Miceli.

But a research assistant, in confederation with the study’s authors, asked the students to say the other two applicants were more qualified.

The research assistant explained to the students that the researchers had been doing the study for some time “and the results are not coming out the way we hypothesized. It’s going to be difficult to publish the results, the way things are going.”

After the students were finished, the research assistant left the room and another person came in. The new person, supposedly a student representative on the “Departmental Committee,” asked the students to fill out a questionnaire. One of the questions asked, “during the study, were you asked to do anything you consider objectionable?” This was the students’ opportunity to report the wrongdoing.

Miceli says one encouraging finding of the study was that even though the great majority of the students didn’t report the research assistant’s fraud, only one in four followed the assistant’s plea to fudge the data.

“Many of the students told us after the study that they believed the proper response was to ignore the request to falsify their answers,” Miceli says. “They didn’t think they needed to report that they were asked to do something wrong.”

There is little doubt that most students considered the research assistant’s actions wrong, Miceli says.

The researchers asked 207 students who didn’t participate in the study if it would be ethical for a research assistant to request that subjects fudge data. About 90 percent said it would be “very wrong” or “wrong.”

(The authors didn’t ask the study participants because they didn’t want to tip the subjects off to the nature of the research.)

Surprisingly, the study also found that people with lower levels of moral development (as measured by a written instrument) were more likely to be whistle-blowers.

People with lower levels of moral development tend to think in terms of punishment and adherence to rules, she says, while those with higher levels of development have more sophisticated principles of right and wrong.

Those with higher levels of moral development may have found more moral conflict in the situation than others, Miceli says. They may have considered social norms against “faking” and decided it was best not to disclose the fraud.

Although threats of retaliation had no effect on whistle-blowing, Miceli says the threats used were relatively minor, because of concerns about use of human subjects. Half the subjects were told not to tell anyone about the request for data fudging or else students would be forced to participate in the experiment again. The other half received no threat.

“Presumably, students would not want to participate a second time as the statement implied,” Miceli says.
Author markets cheating manual at Ohio State

By Jodi Froning
Lantern staff writer

Some people say cheaters never prosper. However, Michael Moore, a 24-year-old junior at Rutgers University in New Jersey, just might prove these people wrong.

Moore is the author of a new book titled "Cheating 101: The Benefits and Fundamentals of Earning the Easy A," which is currently being marketed at three universities, including Ohio State.

The 100-page, six-chapter book contains various cheating techniques for college students.

The idea for the book came after he transferred to Rutgers from St. Francis College in Pennsylvania, Moore said.

After noticing a large number of students cheating at both the small college and the large university level, Moore said he thought it would make an interesting book.

"Research shows that between eight and nine out of ten college students cheat, so I figured I would offer students a written work on the methods that have been passed down for years," he said.

The Lantern is currently running an advertisement for the book in its classified section, and he has already received 40 orders from people at Ohio State in less than a week, Moore said. Overall, 1,000 copies have been sold.

Research for his book was conducted by asking professors and students from around the country, including an OSU student, about familiar cheating methods.

Moore, a journalism major, is publishing the book himself.

So far, he has marketed the book at Rutgers, the University of Maryland and Ohio State. He said Ohio State was on his list because of its size.

The book's author is currently working to get his book sold in a few Rutgers-area bookstores, but not without some difficulty.

Two bookstores, New Jersey Books and Rutgers University Bookstore, have refused to sell the book.

"I felt morally obligated as a book seller to sell scholastic books and felt strange about taking money for something like this," said Alicia English, manager of New Jersey Books.

Rutgers University Bookstore would not comment on the book.

Scarlet Fever, a souvenir shop on the Rutgers campus, has agreed to sell the book.

"It's a funny book. It seems like a cute, funny thing. I don't think it's anything to get uptight about. It probably contains something everyone of us has done at some time or another," said Steve Osterman, owner of Scarlet Fever.

Representatives from two OSU campus bookstores, Long's Book Store and The Ohio State University Bookstore, said they were aware of the book only through the Lantern advertisement, but have not seen it.

Lyssa Chambers, assistant manager of trade books at Long's Book Store, said she wouldn't make a decision about selling the book based on its title and would have to see the book first.

A representative from The Ohio State University Bookstore said the store might consider carrying the book depending on its content and whether or not it contained things that break university policy.

Moore said he hopes to make a profit, but not a killing, from the book.

For now the book is available only by mail order, and the cost is $6. He knew if he charged $15 for the book no one would buy it because that's equivalent to a night out at the bars, he said.

Moore said he hopes to sell 8.5 million copies of his book; one for every college student in America who cheats.
Book shows students how to cheat

By Robert Hanseman
Lantern staff writer

A recent book giving cheating advice and a national study on cheating have focused attention on how students get by without studying. Some see the attention as a result of a cheating outbreak, while others argue there have always been cheaters, and always will be.

Perhaps the most blatant cheating advice is found in Cheating 101: The Benefits and Fundamentals of Earning the Easy A, by Rutgers University junior Michael Moore.

The book dishes out classic cheating ideas such as wearing Walkmans that play recorded answers during tests and activating personal beepers to get excused from class for quick consultation with a friend who has the answers.

About 1,750 copies of Moore's book have been sold around the country. The book has been advertised in the Lantern.

OSU students are not immune to the temptation to cut corners. “In the most general sense, I assume almost all students cheat at one time or another,” said Tom Cuthbert, a senior from Groveport majoring in chemical engineering.

“In one class I took, a lot of people had calculators that could store formulas, so they didn’t have to memorize them” Cuthbert said.

While common statistics on cheating state that only a fourth of all cheaters are caught, a variety of punishments are handed out. Ohio State handles the problem through its Committee on Academic Misconduct, which consists of 18 faculty members, seven graduate students, and 18 undergraduates.

In its most recent report to the University Senate, the committee reported a two-fold increase in the number of charges brought against students. From July 1990 to June 1991, 80 students were charged with giving or receiving aid, while 52 were charged with copying, and 49 with plagiarism.

Maurice Shipley, university coordinator for the committee, said although no firm numbers have been compiled since the last report, the committee has seen another dramatic increase in cases, perhaps as much as a third.

Committee sanctions range from warnings to probation, suspension, dismissal, and others, including a recommendation to professors to reduce a student’s grade. From Summer Quarter 1990 to Spring Quarter 1991, 42 students were suspended for a period of one to four quarters, and 13 received suspensions.

Some students feel that the definition of cheating gets blurry in college. “What most people think of as cheating is accepted practice in physics, at least on homework,” said Gary Rogers, a senior from Dayton majoring in physics and history. "I think cheating on tests is rare, though, and we have the grades to prove it,” Rogers said.

Moore defends his book by saying he’s not teaching anything new. He also criticizes teachers for making cheating easy by using the same teaching methods and tests every year.

Recently, a nationwide cheating survey was conducted by Donald McCabe, associate professor of business ethics at Rutgers University. The survey was completed by 6,097 students at 31 of America’s most elite schools.

Results showed 87 percent admitted cheating at least once in college; 41 percent of undergraduates admitted cheating on exams and 19 percent admitted cheating on four or more tests. McCabe’s study showed students from higher income homes are more likely to be regular cheaters than those from lower income homes.

The survey also showed business majors were the most likely to cheat (87 percent), followed by engineering majors (74 percent). Humanities majors were less likely to cheat, perhaps reflecting the type of work required — essay answers, for instance, are harder to fake than single entry numerical answers.
Court guarantees students the right to due process

By Jo Crawford
Lantern staff writer

Part five of a five-part series

Jim's life is looking a lot brighter these days than it did last year when he faced expulsion from Ohio State.

Had it not been for the due process clause of the Fourteenth Amendment, Jim could have been expelled from the university without even having his side of the story heard.

Jim, 19, from Niles, Ohio, broke the law by cashing a check that belonged to his roommate while living in Steeb Hall his freshman year. Aside from facing possible felony charges for forgery and tampering with mail, he had to appear at a university hearing.

Jim chose to waive his right to a hearing before a student panel at the advice of his attorney and instead participated in an administrative hearing.

The administrative hearing was a meeting conducted by the coordinator of student affairs with Jim and his attorney present, Jim said.

During the hearing, he told his story and his attorney was there to advise him on how to answer any confusing questions.

It was Jim's protection under the Fourteenth Amendment that ensured his right to a fair hearing. Ultimately, based on testimony given at the hearing, the coordinator allowed him to continue his education at Ohio State.

The Fourteenth Amendment says "...nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law."

"Due process is a fluid concept. It changes based on what is at stake," said Sandra Schuster, assistant dean of student life.

"Because there is not a fixed meaning for due process, when reviewed by the courts, due process is seen as a set of scales that weighs the ultimate punishment against the crime committed, Schuster said.

It is a balance that provides fairness in trials, Schuster said.

David Goldberg, an OSU law professor, said that procedural due process is what students face in disciplinary hearings at Ohio State.

"Procedural due process is a fair procedure to determine whether a penalty is fair and appropriate under the circumstances," Goldberg said.

Due process is used against arbitrary decision making and helps to screen out unfairness, Goldberg said.

William Tyznik, a faculty member on the Academic Misconduct Board, said the committee that hears students' cases is made up of three faculty members, and two students, one undergraduate and one graduate.

The only people allowed to speak in a hearing are the student, the faculty member who is making the allegations and the committee members, Tyznik said. The student is allowed to bring an adviser along, but the student must do all of the talking for him or herself, he said.

"The Academic Misconduct Committee is there to provide a fair hearing and not to condemn, Tyznik said.

Students might come away from the hearing without a punishment or just a slap on the wrist, Tyznik said. The wrong the student has done must be pretty blatant for the student to actually get suspended or dismissed, he said.

"Our purpose is to have students do the best they can and have everyone treated fairly," Tyznik said.

The right of due process as guaranteed to students resulted from the 1967 Supreme Court case, Esteban vs. Central Missouri State College, Schuster said.

In the Central Missouri State case the court actually spelled out students' rights as provided by the due process clause, Schuster said.

In this case the court said that a student's property right must be at stake for due process to be relevant in a hearing, she said.

If students have paid fees to the university and are enrolled in courses, then they have a property right in the university, by the court's standards, she said.

The ruling also determined that a student in these cases has the right to examine all evidence before the hearing and have an adviser present, Schuster said.

Students may also question witnesses who bring evidence against them, make a tape recording of the hearing and the final decision must be based only on evidence that is present at the hearing Schuster said.

Ohio State also grants students two more rights that are not mandated by the courts, Schuster said. Ohio State students also have the right to appeal a decision and they may be represented by an attorney in their appeal, she said.

These disciplinary proceedings are spelled out in the Student Code, chapter 3355-27. The Student Code can be found in the student handbook.
Report reveals increased cheating at OSU

By Sayuri Inoue
Lantern staff writer

More students were charged with cheating, copying and plagiarism at Ohio State last year that the previous year, said Richard D. Tallman, chairman of the Committee on Academic Misconduct.

The number of academic misconduct charges against OSU students in 1991-92 increased by 53 percent over the previous year, he said.

The committee heard 565 charges involving 266 students last year compared to 368 charges against 266 students during the 1990-91 school year, according to the committee's annual report.

On average, each student brought before the committee received two matters last year compared to 1.5 charges in 1990-91, Tallman said.

"I think that's a real significant trend that students were found to be involved in more than one charge," he said.

The most frequent offenses were cheating on exams or quizzes and usually involving students helping each other to cheat, Tallman said.

The number of incidents of giving or receiving help rose from 60 reported cases during 1990-91 to 124 during 1991-92, according to the committee's annual report. The number has nearly tripled from three years ago, when there were only 45 reported cases.

Copying another student's work was the next highest incident and the number of these cases nearly doubled from 52 to 101, the committee reported.

The committee's report showed cases of false documentation, such as signing a false grade change sheet, increasing from 12 to 51.

Although the cases of plagiarism showed only a small increase, plagiarism was the third most frequent offense. The number increased from 49 to 59.

Tallman said plagiarism is a serious problem to new students, particularly because they do not know the rules.

"We don't usually see that (not knowing) as an excuse," said Jennifer Boswell, one of seven undergraduate student committee members. The rules are told to all students in UVC class and course syllabuses also spell out what is acceptable to the particular class, she said.

The names of students charged and their specific cases were not available because of the committee's confidential policy.

In many cases, students are charged with academic misconduct because they 'did not read their syllabus and pay attention to some rules,' Tallman said.

Boswell said she found such cases frequently in science laboratories because students often share information with their lab partners.

For instance, when students turn in lab reports with identical mistakes, the case would raise questions about whether they copied, or if their answers happened to be the same because they studied together, she said.

"There is a line and it is fuzzy. I think that's why we get a lot of these cases," she said.

Other charges the committee heard last year were: 64 cases of collision (students who planned to cheat); 55 unauthorized collaborations (students unintentionally involved in cheating); 47 cases of unauthorized material, such as having unofficial answer keys to exams; six alterations of exams; four for ringers (solicitation of another to take exam) and 54 for others, such as misrepresenting class rank to get in a class.

In the code, if instructors see any suspicious behavior, they are required to report it to the committee. The committee is responsible for investigating and making a fair determination, he said.

The committee is comprised of 18 faculty members, seven graduate students and seven undergraduate students, he said. They are divided into subcommittees called "hearing panels," each consisting of three faculty members and two students.

After a case is brought to the committee, a panel conducts a hearing with those directly involved, such as a student and a
faculty member. The committee gives written notice about the hearing to a student at least seven days before the hearing. Tallman said the first hearing is usually scheduled three to four weeks after it receives the faculty member’s accusation. The hearing usually takes 20 to 60 minutes, he said.

Boswell said that when students come to the hearing, many are hostile toward the faculty member who reported the case.

“I think that makes the job of faculty members very difficult because they are obligated to do it,” she said. “I don’t envy the professor who has a case.”

Boswell said faculty members are responsible for telling course rules in the class, but students have responsibility for knowing the code of misconduct as well.

Tallman said although he doesn’t know the reason for the increasing number of charges, students who got through the university’s tougher admission standards might feel pressure to get better grades.

Boswell said the increasing number of charges appears to be only the beginning.

“I guess I should be glad that there are only that many cases at the university side,” she said. She thinks there is more misconduct that is not caught because she sometimes hears students telling about their success in cheating.

“It makes me very frustrated to know that there are students who think about how they can get the best grade, not even considering other students are affected by what they did,” Boswell said.

Tallman said the committee deals with misconduct seriously in order to maintain integrity of a degree.

He said graduate students are treated more severely than undergraduates because they have become more trained in their academic field.

Any student found in violation of academic misconduct has a right to appeal, Tallman said. The committee’s decisions are appealed to the vice president for academic affairs and provost, according to Code of Student Conduct.

Tallman said the number of appealed cases more than doubled last year from 25 to 68.

During the last year, Tallman said 21.3 percent of cases were appealed. 31 appeals were denied, 11 cases resulted in new hearings, six were either reversed or dismissed, and six resulted in reduced sanctions.

There are five different sanctions for violations of the code: warning, disciplinary probation, suspension, dismissal, and others, such as a reduction in grade for an assignment, paper, laboratory, examination or the course. The sanctions are determined by the nature of the offense, the student’s previous record, and the danger on another student involved, Tallman said.
OSU colleges handle academic misconduct problems differently

By Valerie Francini
Lantern staff writer

Going into his academic misconduct hearing last year, Joe Smith was nervous but confident.

A lawyer told him to fight the charges, possession of class material from a past quarter, because his rights had been violated, but other students warned he could be dismissed from Ohio State.

"The whole thing took about a half hour," Smith said of the hearing. "My 'V' was changed to an 'E' and I was placed on probation for one year." Meaning his incomplete grade for the class was changed to a failing grade.

Smith said he didn't expect this outcome. He didn't file an appeal, because he said he didn't think it would change anything. He didn't have the money to pay a lawyer to pursue the matter further.

The way Smith's case was handled is unique. In the Big Ten, only Ohio State handles academic misconduct through a separate committee, according to an internal report compiled by the OSU Office of Student Life.

Other universities handle charges either through individual academic colleges or through the office of the Dean of Student Life.

"We are college-centered here," said Dick Justice, dean of Student Life at the University of Illinois. "If the engineering college takes it more seriously than the English college, that's within their realm."

OSU professors are required to report cases of academic misconduct. Cases are reviewed by the Committee for Academic Misconduct, which recommends penalties for code violations.

The committee is composed of faculty members whose positions rotate every three years and students whose positions rotate annually. All members are volunteers from various disciplines.

At the hearing, both the student and the instructor present their respective accounts of the incident. Students are not permitted to call witnesses on their behalf.

"There is no opportunity for much investigation," University Ombudsperson Betty Jo Hudson said. "It is up to the panel to ferret it out on the spot."

After both sides are presented, the three-faculty, two-student hearing panel then decides the verdict by a majority vote. In guilty verdicts, a penalty is recommended at that time.

"There is no question that this is the worst part of my job," said Robert Tats, who is responsible for investigating and presenting misconduct cases for the Chemistry Department. "I want to be positive about teaching, and this just hurts me."

Instructors who file charges must submit evidence and attend the scheduled hearing. A previous report in the Lantern stated cases usually are resolved in three to four weeks, but in actuality, it can sometimes be much longer.

In Smith's case, he waited three months for his hearing.

"There is a backlog, but often students don't acknowledge receipt of their written notice right away," said former committee member Carol Binner. "This contributes to the already, difficult problem of coordinating a meeting time when all parties can attend."

Tats said many of his cases carry over into following quarters. "If they could be resolved sooner, it would be better," he said.

The hearing panel recommends penalties, but there are no written guidelines for specific charges. The coordinator attends every student hearing, and new panel members sit on panels with more experienced members to ensure consistency, said Katherine Kistler, coordinator for the Committee for Academic Misconduct.

Departments that bring charges also administer the punishments.

Although some said they think the university system is a good one, others think it is biased against students.

"Because there is no investigation by the committee, it sometimes comes down to the professor's word against the student's," said Saundra Schuster, assistant dean of student life. "The panel must make his decision based on very flat, superficial evidence."

In Smith's case, he admitted he had materials the class syllabus specified he should not have, but he said he thought there were other relevant circumstances that weren't considered. He said he thinks the panel is biased in the instructor's favor before the hearing begins, therefore students do not get impartial hearings.

Students can appeal a decision through the associate provost of academic affairs.

"We can help students prepare their letter of appeal," Hudson said. "We also coach students on how to behave in the hearing."

Ombuds services offers assistance to students and faculty who need help preparing for hearings and appeals. They do not act as a representative or advocate for either side, and they do not attend hearings.

"The biggest tragedy is the amount of time consumed for the students, for me, the committee and the committee coordinator," Tats said.

Some said they think leaving colleges to their own discretion encourages inconsistency.

"Having one level above the college, protects the student in the long run," said former OSU Academic Misconduct Committee Member Joe Carpenter.
Academic misconduct policy being reviewed

By Valerie Francini
Lantern staff writer

The University Senate is reviewing the Committee for Academic Misconduct, said Deborah Ballam, Associate Professor of Finance and member of the review committee.

"It's been a long time since the Senate looked at itself and the committees," Ballam said, who is also a member of the steering committee, which looks over cases after the reviewing committee.

"We started with the Committee for Academic Misconduct because there have been complaints, and the process has not been reviewed for several years," she said.

The Committee for Academic Misconduct hears all cases dealing with academic misconduct charges. The hearing panels are composed of students and faculty whose positions rotate on a regular basis.

The committee that is reviewing the procedures of the Committee for Academic Misconduct is meeting weekly throughout the summer and is seeking input from students, instructors and others who have been through the process, Ballam said.

"We need to see if what we are doing is the best way to serve students and the university," said Carol Bininger, a member of the reviewing committee.

While some think Ohio State doesn't handle academic misconduct issues as well as it could, Bininger said she thinks the system is good and is in the best interest of the students.

"If we didn't care about students or the integrity of the university, we wouldn't be doing this," Bininger said. "Then we would just be a diploma mill."

Among the items being discussed are the method by which the committee is set up, training of panel members and guidelines for specific violations, Bininger said.

The committee hopes to have preliminary recommendations by the end of Summer Quarter. The steering committee will decide then if they should be passed on to the Senate for approval.

Because any changes will mean an actual change to university rules, it could be up to a year before they are implemented, Ballam said.

See ACADEMICS / Page two
Student fights to clear name

By Valerie Francini
Lantern staff writer

He is a 43-year-old minister who came to Ohio State in Autumn '92 to pursue a doctorate in social work. He holds two master's degrees, and up until early May, he had a grade point average of 3.71.

Now, if the verdict of the Committee on Academic Misconduct is correct, he is also a cheater.

In March, Tenolian R. Bell Jr. was accused of changing one answer on a scan sheet after it was discovered that a grading computer had recorded one of the answers differently during a second scan. The official charge was "alteration of grades or marks by the student in an effort to change the earned grade or credit.

Bell says that during his academic misconduct hearing, his guilt was judged on the basis that computers don't make mistakes, but he believes another issue was at the root of the charges against him.

"I was in utter, total shock when they told me I was being charged," Bell said with a look of disbelief on his face as he remembered that moment. "I really believe this happened to me because I wrote a letter of complaint about the instructor who was teaching the statistics class I was taking."

Faculty members in the College of Education said that they are "satisfied the proper personnel procedures were followed," according to James Wightl, chair of the Department of Educational Services and Research.

Bell was taking a statistics class, Educational Services and Research 786, during Winter Quarter 1993 when his problems began.

"From the very onset, there was total incompetence in the class," said another student who attended the class with Bell, but did not want to be identified.

The instructor (the instructor) tried to be available and helpful, but her teaching skills were low and her methods unorganized, "the student said. The instructor of the class, Elizabeth Randolph, had taught at least one class and had done consulting for the College of Education prior to teaching Bell's class. She is currently out of the country, Wightl said.

After Bell took the first midterm, and before he received his grade, he wrote a letter to Nancy Zimpfer, acting dean of the College of Education, listing what he believed to be specific problems with the instruction method of the statistics class.

When Randolph returned the tests to the students, there was much debate about the wording of some questions and ambiguity over some of the correct answers, Bell said. In one case, he agreed to accept two alternative answers. Students were told to circle the answer and make a note if their sheet needed to be regraded, Bell said.

Bell said when he took the test, he marked on his answer sheet one of the alternatives Randolph later said she would accept. He noted it and returned the scan sheet.

About four weeks later, and one week before the final exam, Randolph charged Bell with academic misconduct claiming he didn't initially give one of the accepted alternatives, but in fact, changed his wrong answer to one of the three accepted answers in order to get extra credit.

Prior to his hearing with the Committee on Academic Misconduct, Bell filed a complaint with Dispute Resolution Services because he believed retaliation for his complaint letter and possibly racial discrimination were factors that led to the charge of misconduct.

Bell is black. Randolph is white.

Bell requested a postponement of his hearing until his complaint could be investigated. According to a letter from Maurice Shipley, then coordinator of the Committee for Academic Misconduct, the postponement was denied because Bell's complaint of retaliation and discrimination were separate issues from the academic misconduct charge.

The hearing was held May 6. The committee recommended that Bell receive a failing grade for the class, which he did.

"I knew there was no hope after the way the hearing had gone," said Keith Kilty, Bell's academic adviser who attended the hearing with him. "They didn't even listen to Tenolian (Bell) when he spoke."

Kilty waited with Bell while the panel discussed its ruling.

"It took them 10 minutes," Kilty said. "I can't see how they could deliberate for only 10 minutes without already having their minds made up."

A few weeks after the guilty verdict, the Dispute and Resolution Services sent a letter to Bell stating they had found no basis for his complaint of retaliation and racial discrimination.

According to university rules, a guilty verdict from the Committee on Academic Misconduct may be appealed through the office of the Provost in four separate instances, one of which is procedural error, according to Associate Provost Robert Arnold.

Although Bell says at least five procedures were not followed correctly, including being notified of all witnesses to testify against him and being permitted to present all relevant evidence, his request for appeal was denied.

"Claims are carefully studied and the entire process, including tapes and documentation related to the hearing, are reviewed before the Provost makes a decision to accept the appeal or not," Arnold said.

"Students may make claims about the procedures, but investigation often proves otherwise."

Several letters of support from Bell's Ph.D. program committees, his adviser and friends have been sent requesting appeal. Kilty has also written and spoken with OSU President E. Gordon Gee about the matter.

"I was told by Maurice Shipley that the only people who could intervene and end this were the provost and the president," Kilty said. "But two hours after I spoke with Gee on the phone, his office called back to say that they looked into it and found, procedurally, the president could not intervene."

According to Arnold, it is possible in some cases for students to request that misconduct charges be removed from their record following a period after their graduation.

"There is no official policy," Arnold said. "But for some of the less serious offenses, it could be considered."

Bell's Ph.D. program committee found that his grade in the class would have been a "B," and they are not requiring him to repeat the course.

Bell plans to continue his efforts to clear his name.

Many questions remain unanswered for Bell. He wonders why the accuracy of the grading machines was never questioned, what motive the panel believed he had for changing the answer since he received a "B" on the midterm and one point wouldn't have affected his grade and why his appeals continue to be denied.
ACTION calls for fair retrial

By Kim Merlack
Lantern staff writer

Representatives from Afrikan Commit To Improving Our Nation wanted guarantees Monday from OSU Provost Richard Sisson that there will be a fair retrial in the case of a student accused of academic misconduct.

ACTION questioned the fairness of the original academic misconduct hearing in May involving OSU student Tenolian Bell, and asked for changes in the second hearing.

Bell, a doctoral student in social work, was accused of changing an answer on a scan sheet after it was handed back to him Winter Quarter 1993.

The Committee on Academic Misconduct found Bell guilty of the charge of "alteration of grades or marks by the student in an effort to change the earned grade or credit."

The committee is composed of OSU faculty and students. It establishes procedures for dealing with and imposing sanctions on students found in violation of the Code of Student Conduct.

To insure the fairness of Bell's second hearing, ACTION offered suggestions to Sisson they would like to see considered:

* A new, interracial committee to hear Bell's appeal
* An ACTION representative to follow Bell through the appeal process
* A commitment to resolve the hearing by the end of Winter Quarter 1994, more than one year after Bell was originally charged

Bell wrote letters May 24, 1993, and July 12, 1993, to Joan Huber, former OSU provost, requesting an appeal of his case on the basis of "procedural error" by the committee.

He was turned down.

Originally, Sisson had decided that any appeal would not be heard. He then granted Bell the appeal, citing "new material." Sisson would not disclose what the "new material" was.

ACTION representative Siri Rudholm said the committee at Bell's hearing did not follow the rules and guidelines outlined in the student handbook, and ACTION is dedicated to making sure Bell gets a fair appeal or a new hearing.

Sisson would not comment on the procedures followed in the first hearing, but repeatedly stated the committee hearing the appeal would follow appropriate rules.

"The rules themselves violate students' rights. Even if they follow them to the letter, students can get burned," Bell said.

"We are aware there is a committee now that is addressing the inadequacies of that academic misconduct procedure," Rudholm said. "You (Sisson) know it is inadequate and you're telling him to go through it again."

While Sisson said he thinks a different committee will hear Bell's appeal, he would not guarantee it. Sisson also said, "I will make no commitments in respect to the composition of the committee."

ACTION wants to make sure the committee has an African-American faculty member on it, which the first committee lacked, Rudholm said.

"To me there is no doubt in my mind that my case is just representative of what's probably happened to many African-American students," he said.

Sisson said he should be able to respond to ACTION's requests by the week of Nov. 1. "I'm certainly going to try," he said.

While appearing conciliatory at first about ACTION's request for a representative to appear with Bell for his appeal, Sisson later said, "I don't think any particular group has the standing to have representation on the board."

Bell said there is a bigger issue than just his dealings with the Committee for Academic Misconduct. He requested information on previous hearings of OSU students.

"Until this situation is satisfactorily worked out, I intend to fight it as long as I need to fight it," Bell said.

Bell received a failing grade in the course he was accused of altering his test in, and he will be suspended from the university if his appeal is not granted.

He said he would have received a "B" on his midterm exam and was told by his instructor that changing one answer would not have affected his grade.

Bell denied cheating on the test.

He said he was not notified of a witness who was called to testify against him, and was not allowed to present his own evidence or witnesses.

According to Associate Provost Robert Arnold, "procedural error" is one instance where a guilty verdict can be appealed.

Letters from Bell's advisers, professors and fellow students were also written to Huber and OSU President E. Gordon Gee requesting a review of the committee's guilty verdict.
Cheating might lead to student dismissals rather than an ‘E’

By Chris Nelson
Lantern staff writer

Soon if you get caught cheating, you might receive a boot out of the university instead of the "E" typically given.

The final report has been released by the University Senate subcommittee that reviews the rules on academic misconduct. The report outlines several recommendations. The recommendations include allowing tougher sanctions for students who get caught cheating as well as a procedure for getting records of academic misconduct deleted after three years.

Suspensions and dismissals could be possible penalties for cheating at Ohio State, said Robert Mills, a member of the subcommittee. The Council on Academic Misconduct currently recommends students found guilty of cheating get a failing grade in the class in which they committed the offense. Many times these students would have failed the class if they had not cheated, said Deb Ballam, chair of the subcommittee. Getting a failing grade is not an incentive to be honest if the student would have failed anyway, she said.

In addition to other sanctions, a notation should be put on the students transcript for at least two quarters, Ballam said. This would hurt students who are getting ready to send their transcripts to potential employers or graduate schools, she said.

Under the subcommittee’s recommendations, students would no longer be able to use the "freshman forgiveness" rule to remove a failing grade resulting from academic misconduct.

The subcommittee is also recommending that students be allowed to apply to have academic offenses removed from their records three years after their hearing or one year after graduation, whichever comes first, according to the report.

Students who make minor mistakes should not have to have tarnished records forever, Mills said. Removal of minor offenses should be fairly routine, he said.

The subcommittee is also recommending that an advisory committee of faculty and staff members be created to assist students who are going through the academic misconduct process.

Under the recommendation, these advisors would go through a day of training so they would be able to advise students on all aspects of the process, Ballam said.

This is a critical recommendation because it will give students another option for counseling, Ballam said. Students would still be allowed to get advice from lawyers, but with the committee of advisors, all students will have an option aside from members of COAM, she added.

Mills said he thinks students’ cases have been handled fairly in the past, but he also wants them to feel the system is fair.

Training for members of the committee would include information about COAM rules, which evidence is relevant and where the burden of proof lies, Ballam said.

However, the Committee on Academic Misconduct does not agree with this particular recommendation, she added.

Katherine Kisker, COAM coordinator, said "I don't think the committee is opposed to students having advisors at the hearing." But, she said, COAM does not agree with creating another committee.

Ballam said several issues prompted the review of the academic misconduct process. Some concerns about the perceptions of the process and complaints about the way appeals work were expressed by COAM. Some students said they thought the procedures were unfair, she said.

There was a problem with perceptions about the way COAM works around campus, Mills said. However, problems with the mechanics of the process, not the process itself were the ultimate reason for the review, Mills said.

About a half percent of all students at Ohio State, or one in 200 students, goes before COAM each academic year, according to the report.
Misconduct still problem at OSU, but cases decline

By Jessica Gates
Lantern staff writer

For most students, the definitions of academic misconduct and plagiarism are made clear in both UVC and English courses.

Last year, however, 280 students were brought before the Committee on Academic Misconduct with allegations that they violated the Code of Student Conduct.

Katherine Kisker, coordinator of the committee, does not expect that number to change much this year. The committee heard 300 cases of student misconduct in 1995.

The most common forms of cheating involve students assisting other students in an "unauthorized way," or a student "collaborating too closely" with another student, Kisker said.

When a student is alleged to have violated the Code of Student Conduct, he or she appears before a panel of committee members for a hearing.

Although the committee consists of 18 faculty members, seven graduate students and seven undergraduate students, the panel at each hearing includes only three faculty and two student members.

James Tootle, assistant dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, said on average he attends one academic misconduct hearing for students a week.

The committee treats students with respect and does not assume a student is guilty when they walk through the door, Tootle said.

"I really respect what the committee does. They have a hard job," he said. "They let the students say what they want to say. The panel wants to get it all out on the table."

Kisker said student reactions to misconduct allegations often vary. Some students readily acknowledge the incident, she said. Other times, students claim the account is inaccurate. They then work to tell the panel their perception of the incident.

If the student is found in violation, the college representative provides background information on the student to help the committee come up with a proper penalty, Tootle said.

"The committee makes the punishment fit the crime," he said. "Often, the penalty is an 'E' on the assignment or an 'E' in the course with some period of probation."

He said suspension or dismissal from the university is only considered in serious cases where the action was premeditated — paying another student to take an exam or breaking into a college office to steal a test.

Tootle said the process is for the student's benefit. "It is better for the student to go through the proper channels and have an impartial panel hear the case than to have the professor be both the prosecutor and the judge," he said.

Tootle said he holds a follow-up conference with the students in order to help them see the effects of their actions.

"Often, they are pretty good students who are worried about not getting an A or a B," Tootle said. "Most are first-time offenders who made a poor judgement or an immature decision and didn't think of the consequences."

Making students aware of how the committee worked and what the penalties could be may serve as a prevention against students cheating, he said.

Gerald Kosicki, an associate professor of journalism and graduate studies chairman, has taken several students before the committee.

The cases take a lot of time, and the committee often runs behind, Kosicki said.

"I think that it is an important function to take the time to pursue these cases, if only for the moral development of the student," he said.

Kosicki said he was surprised to learn professors are not told the entire outcome of a student's misconduct case. Both Tootle and Kisker defend this practice because of the student's confidentiality.
Sixty percent of Ohio State students cheat, survey says

By Randal Oliver
Lantern staff writer

"Sixty percent of the respondents said they had engaged in some form of academic misconduct," she said.

Even though every OSU student did not respond to the survey, the numbers represented the entire student body.

To emphasize the fact, she said if there are about 50,000 students at Ohio State, 15,000 have cheated.

While the numbers are high, she said we must keep in mind that there are several forms of academic misconduct.

Minor offenses include having someone else sign a class roster for an absent student. Severe cases involve claiming a chapter in another source as your own work, this is known as plagiarism, she said.

According to the 1993-94 committee annual report, 283 cases were brought to the committee for review. Plagiarism is the most frequent charge. The report showed 23 cases of plagiarism and 39 students were caught for cheating. Another 100 students were charged for instances related to both plagiarism and cheating.

Bininger said plagiarism is difficult to catch.

"Sometimes, the teacher can't prove plagiarism," she said.

The instructor has difficulty catching instances of plagiarism because the original source is difficult to obtain or is not available at all, she said.

She said one teacher caught a plagiarizer by luck.

One day an instructor was walking down High Street, and happened to notice an advertisement for mail order term papers. The instructor sent away for a paper, she said.

The day the mail order arrived, students turned in their papers. One student's work was the same paper the teacher ordered, she said.

To help solve cheating problems, the committee offers advice to faculty about issues of prevention and spotting violations, said Nicholas Hall, the current committee chair and professor of business.

A part of this faculty outreach is a sheet that explains how to minimize cases of academic misconduct, Hall said.

The prevention measures include specifying course procedures more carefully in the syllabus, spacing students at greater distances during exams or using multiple versions of the same exams, and also specifying the consequences of academic misconduct in the syllabus.

When a student is brought forward on charges of academic misconduct, Bininger said the case goes to the committee coordinator, Katherine Kiser.

Kiser said she receives the case materials, assigns the charges, reviews the evidence with the student, and the instructor, coordinates a hearing schedule and advises the student about the case before the hearing.

The case is then heard by a five member hearing panel consisting of three faculty members and two graduate or undergraduate students.

Bininger, Kiser and Hall said objectivity and neutrality are ensured throughout the entire hearing process.

All three also pointed out that cases are based on evidence alone.

"We base our decision on the greater weight of evidence," Bininger said. "It's not enough to say you (teacher) know they're in violation."

According to last year's annual report, the committee heard 283 cases. Two hundred and forty, 72.1 percent, of students were found to be in violation of the academic code of conduct.

Seventy-nine, or 27.9 percent, were not found in violation.

The panel decides on the student's sanction, or punishment, by majority vote, she said.

Sanctions vary from warnings to dismissals. The majority, or 99 students, found in violation were put on three quarters of disciplinary probation, according to the 1993-94 annual report.

Kiser said several factors are involved in a sanction, such as class rank, context of the case, and mitigating circumstances.

Bininger said premeditation is also a factor.

Usually, cases of academic misconduct are instances of plagiarism committed by freshmen who aren't used to college writing levels and who don't plan accordingly, she said.

While this process is traumatic for the student, Hall said the committee tries to offer hope.
Academic pressure raises students’ incentive to cheat

Course overload, need to graduate tempts students

By Randal Oliver
Lantern staff writer

Editor’s note: This is the second part of a three-part series.

Pressure can be found in water valves, gas pipes, engine pistons—and students.

Pressure is a major reason students commit academic misconduct, said James Tootle, assistant dean secretary of the College of Arts and Sciences.

A pressure situation might exist if a student has a midterm and two papers due on the same day. The temptation to cheat, Tootle said, “It’s sad in a way. If the offender had thought it through, they wouldn’t be in the position they’re in,” he said.

In the 1993-94 academic year this pressure resulted in 283 cases brought before the Committee on Academic Misconduct, which hears all university cheating cases. Out of this total, 211 students were enrolled in one of three colleges: University College, the College of Arts and Sciences or the College of Engineering, the annual Committee on Academic Misconduct Report said.

Carol Binerger, a former committee chair and professor of nursing, said this is logical because there are more students in these disciplines.

“Those units have thousands of students, where as nursing or human ecology only have a few hundred,” Binerger said.

According to the 1993-94 committee report, University College had the largest amount of students charged with academic misconduct, 106 or 38.5 percent.

Out of these 109 students, there were 57 freshmen, 35 sophomores, 15 juniors and no seniors, the report said.

However, these numbers do not reflect all University College students, said Janet Pink, an adviser for University College. “There are 14,000 students in University College. These numbers are deceiving,” Pink said.

The majority of students Pink advises are freshmen charged with plagiarism. She said they are caught in this situation because they are unprepared for college writing courses.

“The student feels a lot of pressure when they write and they don’t understand how different college can be,” she said.

The College of Arts and Sciences also sees plagiarism among the students they enroll but the majority of these students are seniors, Tootle said.

According to the report, 60 College of Arts and Sciences students were up on charges of academic misconduct.

Of these students, one was a freshman, 13 were sophomores, 19 were juniors and 27 were seniors, the report said.

Students found guilty can not be released because of the 1974 Privacy Act.

Tootle said this substantial amount of seniors charged with cheating can be explained by the fact that most of Arts and Sciences’ students are juniors and seniors.

“Most of our students are juniors and seniors. There aren’t that many freshmen, so the statistics are skewed toward seniors,” he said.

He added that the college of Arts and Sciences has 9,000-10,000 students, which could also affect the statistics.

Tootle explained that a lot of seniors commit academic misconduct because they are in a hurry to graduate.

“One reason seniors commit academic misconduct is due to the fact that they are desperate to graduate and run out of patience,” he said.
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Departments devise creative methods to catch cheaters

By Randal Oliver
Lantern staff writer

Editor’s note: This is the final story in a three-part series.

If you thought Fort Knox was tough to break into, try beating the security measures used by the Chemistry, Math and Psychology Departments to prevent cheating.

There were 283 cases of academic misconduct heard during the 1993-94 academic year. Of these, 91 cases (33 percent) were from classes in the Chemistry, Math and Psychology units, according to the annual report of the Committee on Academic Misconduct.

These three departments would report a large deal of cheating because they have the most students in their classes, said Carol Bininger, a former committee chair and professor in nursing.

The report also said 146 (51 percent) of the cases came from 100 level classes. Five hundred level classes came in a distant second with 96 cases, or 12.7 percent.

It makes sense that over half of these cases came from 100 level classes because they have the largest amount of students, especially freshmen, Bininger said.

"Because freshmen are inexperienced, sometimes they make dumb decisions," Bininger said.

Katherine Kiker, committee coordinator, said there are many possible reasons why 500 level classes came in second.

One explanation was that there are more classes at the 500 level than any other level, Kiker said.

Chemistry reported the largest number of suspected academic misconduct cases with 96 (19 percent) of the total, according to the report.

Chemistry courses at the 100 level often catch students cheating on their lab reports, said Charles Plummer, a graduate student in Chemistry.

"The most frequent cases have been falsification of lab reports," Plummer said. "These cases are the easiest to catch because the student can only know a certain amount of information about the lab without attending the lab."

Falsification of reports includes copying another student's lab results or turning in last year's lab report, he said.

Most students who are caught cheating on lab reports are caught when the data does not match the results associated with the unknown, Plummer said.

Before a chemistry student can begin an experiment, the instructor gives the student an unknown, which is the substance to be tested, he said.

If a student turns in a lab report from a previous quarter, the data will not apply to the actual unknown, Plummer said.

Chemistry has the largest amount of suspected cheating cases because it consists of two learning experiences, the lab and the lecture, Kiker said.

The chances of finding cases of academic misconduct have increased because of these two components, Kiker said.

A second reason why Chemistry finds more cases of academic misconduct is that it's consequences, Kiker said.

"(Chemistry) maintains a close adherence to their standards and policies," she said.
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Daniel Shapiro, a professor of Math, said a major source of cheating in the 150 level courses is from "ringers" or students who take a test in place of others.

To stop this practice, students are required to leave their student identification card on their desks during the test, Shapiro said.

Teaching assistants check IDs to make sure the student taking the test matches the student in the picture, he said.

To prevent the "ringer" from exchanging their ID with the actual students, recitation instructors attend exam locations because they often know the actual students by name and face, Shapiro said.

The Psychology Department also faces the problem of cheating. The department came in third with 18 cases, or 6 percent of total, according to the report.

Cheating during exams is a major concern of the department, said Sheryl Hooley and Bob Tigner, the Psychology 100 coordinators.

Psychology 100 uses several strategies to stop cheating during final exams, Hooley and Tigner said.

One way to prevent cheating is to use different versions of the exam each quarter, they said.

This measure prevents students from taking the exam early and telling others its content, Hooley said.

The unit also takes precautions to prevent ringers or other students from stealing the tests when they are distributed, Hooley said.

To stop these problems, students are required to give their OSU IDs to the instructors before the exam. The IDs are given back to the students when they finish taking the exam, Hooley said.
OSU law students can't serve on panel

Panel evaluates students' misconduct

Nancy Snively
Lantern staff writer

Ohio State students accused of violating the student code will not be judged by law students on the academic misconduct panel because there is not enough money. Placing law students on the panel will not be possible until the resources are available and law students can earn credit, said Vice President of Student Affairs David Williams.

A massive restructuring of the law school and $250,000 to $500,000 would be needed to add enough faculty to allow students to sit on the panel, said David Goldberger, director of the OSU law clinic.

Two types of infractions will land students in the university judicial system - academic misconduct and violations of the student code.

Students who violate the academic misconduct code by cheating or plagiarizing will go before the Committee for Academic Misconduct. Students charged with violating the code will face either the administration or the panel, which is comprised of faculty, staff and students. The OSU law clinic does not have enough people to sit on the panel.

The clinic is only able to select very few of the hundreds of cases presented to it each year. The cases are selected on their teaching potential because the clinic is actually a class for law students. The cases are usually selected at the end of the summer in order to correspond with the academic schedule of the law school.

"This is a big campus and there are a lot of legal problems," said Goldberger.

Williams agreed with the money issue, and brought up another reason for not endorsing the plan.

"If faculty members have four classes each, for each faculty member supervising this program full time, we need someone else to cover those four classes," Williams said.

Lack of staff at Ohio State is one reason why students aren't on the panel, but other universities have different reasons.

Capital University, for example, prohibits lawyers and law students from being present at any student hearings, except criminal hearings, said Mark Cooper, a spokesman for Capital University.

Even at criminal hearings, lawyers and law students may only advise the student, Cooper said. They may not question witnesses or take part in any other way, he said.

"Goldberger said that is probably because administrators in the hearing are not legally trained, and the participation of lawyers would create an uneven playing field."

However, Goldberger does not agree with that thinking because the stakes for the students are high.

"I don't believe there are any such restrictions at Ohio State," Goldberger said.

Other universities have been able to start legal assistance programs for students. The University of Illinois and the University of Iowa both include students from their respective law schools, and Michigan State has a good program, even though the university does not have a law school, Williams said.

"I don't know where they get their lawyers," Williams said.

Some schools around the country allot a portion of the student fee to legal services for students. The university then has a contract with lawyers and the services provided sometimes include tenant/landlord disputes.
Cheaters beware: TAs are watching

Jeff Forward
Lantern staff writer

Cheat happens.

There were 236 cases of academic misconduct in the 1994-95 school year, said Katherine Kisker, the coordinator of the Committee on Academic Misconduct. Kisker said she expects this year's tally to be higher due to the number of violations already this year.

Cheating occurs most frequently in large classes taken to meet General Education Curriculum requirements and prerequisites. Some of these problem classes are chemistry, math, biology, and plant biology, Kisker said.

Peter Curtis, assistant professor of plant biology, said students in large classes believe they are less identifiable and therefore are more likely to cheat.

When students are accused of cheating, they face a hearing before the committee, Kisker said. "Most students are unaware of the process and how it works even though they have a student handbook which explains the procedures followed by the committee," she said.

The committee consists of 18 faculty members, seven graduate students and seven undergraduate students. The faculty members are chosen by the University Senate, the graduate students by the Council of Graduate Students, and the undergraduate students by the Undergraduate Student Government. Hearings are held by five members of the committee.

Students are notified of their hearing date, time, and location at least seven days before the hearing takes place.

If a student is found guilty of cheating, which violates the Code of Student Conduct, a variety of sanctions can be imposed. They include a warning, a lowered grade in the course or the assignment, disciplinary probation, suspension from OSU, restitution, or dismissal.

"Dismissals are not that frequent," Kisker said.

Students who are found not guilty of cheating are cleared of all charges and receive the grade that was initially issued to them for the work in question. In addition, all records of a hearing involving that student are discarded.

Instructors who suspect cheating are required to give students a grade as if no cheating occurred and then report the student to the committee, Kisker said.

If a problem is found, the instructor of record for the course writes a report about the incident and submits it to the department chairperson.

The chairperson sends the report to the committee with a letter of support for the charges.

Wanda White, a graduate teaching associate in plant biology, said cases involving minor cheating on worksheets and quizzes are hard to prosecute.

"Only the most serious cases get to the chairperson's desk as formal charges," Curtis said.

It is hard to get a case to the committee because the graduate teaching assistants report suspected misconduct to the course instructor who then decide if the case will be sent to the committee, White said.

Only one of five cases where two teaching assistants viewed two students looking off each other's papers reached the committee, White said.

Of the five cases White mentioned, Curtis said four were solved by the teaching assistant and the students. More formal charges were not needed.

"Cases are often solved after the instructor has a one-to-one conference with the student," Curtis said.

Decisions of the committee can be appealed within 14 days of the decision to Richard Sisson, senior vice president for academic affairs and provost. Any record of student misconduct is confidential and not available to the public without permission of the student.
TO: University Deans, Department Chairpersons, Faculty and Teaching Associates

FROM: Richard Sisson, Senior Vice President for Academic Affairs and Provost

DATE: September 23, 1996

RE: Academic Misconduct

On behalf of the Committee on Academic Misconduct, I would like to remind the instructional staff to report suspected cases of academic misconduct to the Committee. Academic misconduct is defined as any activity which tends to compromise the academic integrity of the institution, or subvert the educational process. See Faculty Rule 3335-31-02. Comprised of faculty and students, the Committee on Academic Misconduct is a standing Committee of University Senate. The Committee establishes procedures for dealing with academic dishonesty, conducts hearings on charges of alleged misconduct, and imposes sanctions (which may include grading recommendations) when students are found in violation of the Code of Student Conduct. The procedures of the Committee are designed to protect both the instructional staff member and the student.

Part of the role of every member of the instructional staff should be to educate students about academic honesty and integrity and conversely behaviors that might constitute academic misconduct. This includes clear statements in course syllabi and other course materials about expectations and the consequences of dishonesty. Faculty should also be aware of the sources of information that students may use in an unauthorized manner (e.g. the Internet) and structure assignments that assess the student’s level of achievement in their enrolled coursework.

If allegations of misconduct should arise, it is important you be as confident as possible that a violation has occurred and that you exercise sensitivity in bringing forward suspected cases of academic misconduct. Every effort should be made to inform the student of the allegation in a clear concise manner. The Committee recommends you to have a colleague present with you (who can maintain this information with confidentiality) when you inform the student of your allegations. The consequences for a student accused of academic misconduct - regardless of the outcome of the eventual hearing - is unsettling to most and devastating for some, particularly those who believe themselves to be innocent or are unaware that certain types of behavior are indeed academic misconduct.
Since the Committee on Academic Misconduct does not conduct investigations
before the hearing it is essential that all materials presented be carefully compiled
and considered before the case is forwarded. The procedure in forwarding a case
calls for you to prepare a typed written report on department letterhead. The
report should be as complete as possible and should have all relevant evidence
attached. When possible, original documents, e.g. papers, exam sheets, etc. should
be submitted and sources of plagiarized material with passages that have allegedly
been plagiarized clearly marked. A copy of the course syllabus should be included.
The instructor of record for the course, if different than the person observing the
alleged misconduct, must provide a letter acknowledging the charges are being
brought forward.

The report should be reviewed by the department chairperson of the academic unit.
The chairperson should attach a letter indicating that the materials have been
reviewed and transmit the materials to the Coordinator of the Committee on
Academic Misconduct. 1110 Lincoln Tower, 1800 Cannon Drive within three
working days. If possible the report should be hand delivered and marked
"Confidential". The Coordinator, on behalf of the Committee will officially notify
the student of the charges and whenever possible, provide a copy of all materials
that have been received regarding the case.

Once the case has been processed by the Coordinator, a hearing before a panel of
members of the Committee on Academic Misconduct and the Coordinator will be
scheduled. Hearings are restricted to those directly involved in the case. The
persons expected to be present at the hearing will include the member of the
instructional staff bringing the allegations or a department representative, the
student against whom allegations have been made, a representative from the
student’s enrollment unit, and those requested by the accused or hearing panel to
be present who have information directly related to the situation.

Students suspected of academic misconduct, whether acknowledging involvement
or not, should be allowed to continue in the course without prejudice pending a
hearing by the Committee. If the course ends before the Committee has acted, the
instructor should assign a grade of Incomplete in accord with Rule 3334-7-21. The
alternate grade assigned for the Incomplete would be that which will be given if the
student is not found in violation of The Code of Student Conduct.

One note of caution, if you suspect a student of academic misconduct and invoke
a grade reduction without going through the procedure of referring the case to the
Committee you are operating independently without the support of faculty rules and
are abridging the student’s rights.
One final point, it is imperative to maintain confidentiality of alleged academic misconduct. The instructor should confine his or her remarks exclusively to individuals who must be informed. Sharing information about an alleged act of misconduct with anyone not directly involved in the case is not only unfair to the student, but also violates the Family Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 which requires that the privacy of the student must be maintained.

If you wish any clarification or assistance, please contact the Coordinator of the Committee, Katherine Kisker (292-7262). Copies of the Procedures of the Committee on Academic Misconduct are readily available by contacting the office of the Committee on Academic Misconduct (292-7262), 1110 Lincoln Tower, 1800 Cannon Drive.
‘Cheater’ websites gaining popularity

By Christal Jones
Lantern staff writer

Students can access “cheater” websites in Ohio State’s computer labs, but using them can carry serious consequences.

If students choose to use information from such websites, they could get caught committing academic misconduct, said Bob Kalal of University Technology Affairs.

“We do not censor anything,” Kalal said. “The use of the information is the responsibility of the student.”

Cheater.com, a website designed by anonymous teenagers, gives students access to book reports and term papers. Students can print these papers at no charge.

However, students must fill out a membership form to gain full access to the site.

Along with the membership form, a copy of a paper the student has written is required. The designers of the website remind students to remove their names from the papers they send, because “a teacher may get a hold of the paper.”

The website creators claim they have 5,300 members and a few thousand more join every month. The teens behind Cheater.com do not guarantee students an A in classes which they obtain information from the site and warn that the reports and papers are not error-proof.

“We are not here to promote plagiarism. If you turn in a paper from this site as your own, you are hurting yourself. Cheater.com is meant to be used as a resource,” the designers told members.

The first page of the site explains what kind of information is available to members.

“If you guessed everything—you are right,” the teens wrote. “We have a collection of book reports that may have taken as much as four hours of your time.”

According to the site, some states have outlawed selling term papers and other materials online. However, Ohio does not have such a law.

If a faculty member suspects a student may have plagiarized, the student can be charged with academic misconduct, said Katherine Kiaker, OSU academic misconduct coordinator.

The academic policies in place at OSU are sufficient to control the problem of student access to websites like Cheater.com, she said.

Cheater.com is not the only website of its kind. Another site is Schoolsucks.com, which also tells students not to plagiarize.

“Do yourself a favor — don’t turn these papers in,” Schoolsucks.com creators wrote to their users. “Your teachers, professors and the media are always visiting Schoolsucks.”

Some students said they might use these websites to gain information, but not to cheat.

“I would use the sites for reference material, but I wouldn’t plagiarize,” said Omar Hamed, a senior majoring in biology.

“The consequences, like getting expelled, are too drastic.”

Censoring these websites is not the answer, said Joseph Lynch, acting chair of the OSU Department of History.

“I create paper topics that I believe could not be found anywhere,” Lynch said. “I give students a paper assignment on a particular topic with very specific questions.”

OSU English Department Chair James Phelan said most instructors in his department also give specific assignments that are difficult to generalize.

Students should realize their professors could also gain access to these “cheater” websites because there is no way to block access them, he said.
Number of misconduct cases down for 1996-97

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Charges 1996-1997</th>
<th>Number found in violation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copying work of another</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plagiarism</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of work not performed in lab</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unauthorized collaboration</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>False submission of work; Falsification of data</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possession and/or use of unauthorized materials</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alteration of administrative paperwork, forgery</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of work from a previous quarter</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Giving and/or receiving aid in an unauthorized manner</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alteration of an examination and resubmission in an effort to change the earned grade or credit</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other forms of academic misconduct</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

By Christa Jones
Lantern staff writer

Fewer cases of academic misconduct were reported last year, but misconduct remains a problem at Ohio State, according to the Committee on Academic Misconduct's annual report.

The trend of students committing misconduct seems to be the same, said Katherine Kisker, head of the committee.

"Cases forwarded to the committee may reflect only a fraction of the actual incidences of misconduct," the report stated.

"A reasonable quarter of the cases come from 100 level courses. The remaining cases come from 200 to 900 level courses. No cases were heard from the 900 level.

"Most of the cases came from 100 level courses probably because a lot of the students in those classes are freshmen," said Kevin Sanders, a student member of the committee. "They probably just don't understand the university's policies on academic misconduct."

Sanders said the committee assigned to a specific case does not know anything about the case until immediately before the hearing.

The committee reported hearing 203 misconduct cases from the summer of 1996 to spring of 1997, 67 fewer than the year before. Of those cases, 72 percent, or 146 students, were found to be in violation of the code on academic misconduct, according to the committee report.

The report states a majority of the cases come from 100 level courses. The remaining cases come from 200 to 900 level courses. No cases were heard from the 900 level.

"Most of the cases came from 100 level courses probably because a lot of the students in those classes are freshmen," said Kevin Sanders, a student member of the committee. "They probably just don't understand the university's policies on academic misconduct."

Sanders said this is a way to ensure a fair hearing to the student involved.

A punishment or sanction is issued to a student depending upon the violation committed, Sanders said. He said the committee takes into consideration if students have committed academic misconduct in the past and if they are remorseful for their actions.

Sanctions given to the students who were found in violation were as follows:

- 108 disciplinary probations
- 27 warnings
- Six temporary suspensions
- Five suspensions
- Two dismissals

There are referral procedures an academic unit or an office must follow when reporting a possible violation of academic misconduct, Kisker said.
TO: University Deans, Department Chairpersons, Faculty and Teaching Associates

FROM: Edward J. Ray, Executive Vice President and Provost

DATE: Monday, October 11, 1999

RE: Academic Misconduct

On behalf of the Committee on Academic Misconduct, I would like to remind the instructional staff to report suspected cases of academic misconduct to the Committee. Academic Misconduct is defined as any activity which tends to compromise the academic integrity of the institution, or subvert the educational process. See Faculty Rule 3335-31-02. Comprised of faculty and students, the Committee on Academic Misconduct is a standing Committee of University Senate. The Committee establishes procedures for dealing with alleged academic misconduct, conducts hearing on charges of alleged misconduct, and imposes sanctions (which may include grade recommendations) when students are found in violation of the Code of Student Conduct. The procedures of the Committee are designed to protect both the instructional staff member and the student.

Part of the role of every member of the instructional staff should be to educate students about academic honesty and integrity and conversely behaviors that might constitute academic misconduct. This includes clear statements in course syllabi and other course materials about expectations and the consequences of dishonesty. Faculty should also be aware of the sources of information that students may use in an unauthorized manner (e.g. the Internet) and structure assignments that assess the students level of achievement in their enrolled coursework.

If allegations of misconduct should arise, it is important you be as confident as possible that a violation has occurred and that you exercise sensitivity in bringing forward suspected cases of academic misconduct. Every effort should be made to inform the student of the allegation in a clear concise manner. The Committee recommends that you have a colleague present with you (who can maintain this information with confidentiality) when you inform the student of your allegations.
The consequences for a student accused of academic misconduct - regardless of the outcome of the eventual hearing - are unsettling to most and devastating for some, particularly those who believe themselves to be innocent or are unaware that certain types of behavior are indeed academic misconduct.

Since the Committee on Academic Misconduct does not conduct investigations before the hearing, it is essential that all materials presented be carefully compiled and considered before the case is forwarded. The procedure in forwarding a case calls for you to prepare a typed written report on department letterhead. The report should be as complete as possible and should have all relevant evidence attached. When possible, original documents, e.g. papers, exam sheets, etc. should be submitted. If the allegation is plagiarism, sources of plagiarized materials should be included with passages that have allegedly been plagiarized clearly marked. A copy of the course syllabus should be included. The instructor of record for the course, if different than the person observing the alleged misconduct, must provide a letter acknowledging the charges are being brought forward.

The department chairperson of the academic unit should review the report. The chairperson should attach a letter indicating that the materials have been reviewed and transmit the materials to the Coordinator of the Committee on Academic Misconduct, 1110 Lincoln Tower, 1800 Cannon Drive within three (3) working days. If possible the report should be hand delivered and marked “Confidential”. The Coordinator on behalf of the Committee will officially notify the student of the charges and whenever possible, provide a copy of all materials that have been received regarding the case.

Once the Coordinator has processed the case, a hearing before a panel of members of the Committee on Academic Misconduct will be scheduled. Hearings are restricted to those directly involved in the case. The persons expected to be present at the hearing include the member of the instructional staff bringing the allegations (or a departmental representative), the student against whom allegations have been made, a representative from the student’s enrollment unit, and any witnesses requested by the accused, the Coordinator, or hearing panel who have information directly related to the situation.

Students suspected of academic misconduct, whether acknowledging involvement or not, should be allowed to continue in the course without prejudice pending a hearing by the Committee. If the course ends before the Committee has acted, the instructor should assign a grade of Incomplete in accord with Rule 3334-7-21. The alternate grade assigned for the Incomplete would be that which will be given if the student is not found in violation of The Code of Student Conduct.
A note of caution: if you suspect a student of academic misconduct and invoke a grade reduction without going through the procedure of referring the case to the Committee you are operating independently without the support of faculty rules and are abridging the student’s rights.

Finally, it is imperative to maintain confidentiality of alleged academic misconduct. The instructor should confine his or her remarks exclusively to individuals who must be informed. Sharing information about an alleged act of misconduct with anyone not directly involved in the case is not only unfair to the student, but also violates the Family Rights and Privacy Act of 1974 which requires that the privacy of the student must be maintained. If you wish any clarification or assistance, please contact the Coordinator of the Committee, Katherine Kisker (292-7262). The Procedures of the Committee on Academic Misconduct are readily available by contacting the office of the Committee on Academic Misconduct (292-7262), 1110 Lincoln Tower, 1800 Cannon Drive or on-line at www.coam.admin.ohio-state.edu.
Dear colleagues,

I thought you might be interested in this new video about plagiarism that was done by the Committee on Academic Misconduct. It is now in the Knowledge Bank. Please feel free to pass it along to whomever you think might be interested.

Best,
Tamar Chute

From: "Eberlin, Elizabeth" <Eberlin.1@osu.edu>
To: "Curry, Tim" <Curry.6@osu.edu>

Good Afternoon,

The new video, “Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism,” is now available online in the Knowledge Bank of the main library. This video provides an opportunity for students and instructors to learn what constitutes plagiarism, and how to prevent it. There are three versions of the video in the Knowledge Bank, a full-length version (about 8 minutes), an International version, and a short version (about 5 minutes).

The link to the Knowledge Bank collection is: http://hdl.handle.net/1811/46848

For questions about accessing the Knowledge Bank, please contact Maureen Walsh at Walsh.260@osu.edu.

Tim Curry

Timothy J. Curry, Ph.D.
Coordinator, Committee on
Academic Misconduct (COAM)
Room 107
33 W. 11th Avenue
Columbus, OH 43201-2013
Phone (614) 292-7262
Fax (614) 292-2914
E-mail curry.6@osu.edu
oaa.osu.edu/coam/home.html

--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------
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Is it too easy to cheat in online college courses?

By Joshua Lim
The Columbus Dispatch • Friday May 29, 2015 4:43 AM

Comments: 1 3 12 26

An Ohio State student's entrepreneurial approach to academics cost almost two dozen fellow students some money — and academic discipline.

An investigation by the university's Committee on Academic Misconduct found that an unidentified student completed online course work for 23 other classmates in exchange for payment. All of the students were punished — some with expulsion, for paying what is an unknown amount of money for the cheating.

Federal educational privacy laws prohibit OSU from releasing the names of the students involved or the specific punishments handed down.

The incident raises questions about whether the growth in online courses has led to a corresponding increase in cheating.

The OSU students were cheating on a food-science course offered fall semester by the College of Food, Agriculture and Environmental Sciences, spokesman Chris Davey said.

The disciplinary action, including "several dismissals and other forms of discipline," were imposed this spring. OSU does not have data on how often students cheat in online classes.

The Committee on Academic Misconduct found 457 students in violation of rules against academic dishonesty during the 2013-14 school year, according to the committee's annual report, which did not specify whether violations occurred in online courses. Numbers for the 2014-15 school aren't yet available.

Some research has shown that students are just as likely to cheat in online courses as they would in live courses.

In a study of 695 undergraduates and graduates from a mid-size university in Appalachia, two researchers at Marshall University in Huntington, W.Va., found that 32.1 percent admitted to cheating in a live class, while 32.7 percent admitted to cheating in an online class at some point while in college.

The research also found that students taking online courses were more prone to have someone else give them answers during a test or quiz.

To curb online cheating, some universities have partnered with companies that specialize in online-exam monitoring such as ProctorU.

ProctorU is an online service that monitors students during exams through webcam and screen-sharing technology. The proctoring service also requires test-takers to show their ID to the camera and asks them to answer questions based on their public records.

Franklin Hayes, a spokesman for ProctorU, said a lot of schools used the honor system for online exams but found it was unreliable.
"When people realize that there's somebody there kind of watching them take the exam, they are a lot less likely to attempt something," Hayes said.

Students still try to cheat despite having someone observing them through a webcam, said Paul Creed III, Kent State University's technology-project director. He said he receives one to two reports each semester of cheating attempts documented by ProctorU.

Last year, Kent State signed a three-year contract to make ProctorU the university's standard remote-proctoring service.

Davey declined to say what steps Ohio State takes to prevent cheating in online courses because it would undermine their effectiveness.

"We do not have an indication that this is a widespread practice, but we will continue to monitor vigilantly," he said. "No form of cheating is tolerated at Ohio State, and we have systems in place to stop it, as this case demonstrates."

jlim@dispatch.com

@JoshuaLim93
OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

83 business students accused of cheating

By Jennifer Smola The Columbus Dispatch

Dozens of students at Ohio State University are accused of cheating on graded assignments in a business course using a group messaging app last school year.

An investigation by Ohio State’s Committee on Academic Misconduct resulted in 83 undergraduate students charged with violations of the school’s code of student conduct, the university said in a statement.

A professor reported the allegations against the students, who were enrolled in a Fisher College of Business course, in April. The charges include “unauthorized collaboration on graded assignments,” the university’s statement said.

The students allegedly used GroupMe, a free group messaging app available on multiple phones and tech devices that supports calendar and document sharing.

According to Ohio State’s Code of Student Conduct, violations can result in punishment that ranges from a formal reprimand to a suspension to dismissal from the university in severe cases. Sanctions for unauthorized collaboration can also include grade penalties.

Students charged with academic misconduct violations can accept responsibility for the charge or request a hearing before the Committee on Academic Misconduct.

The Code of Student Conduct applies to academic misconduct whether it happens on or off campus, in a classroom or online, Ohio State spokesman Ben Johnson said in an email.

“Students are welcome to use social media tools like GroupMe to communicate with classmates but must remember that the rules are the same for online and in-person interactions,” he said.

Sharing a due date for a homework assignment is fine, Johnson said, but sharing the answers to a final exam is not.

“Students should not share anything online that is prohibited by the rules for the course,” he said.

ismola@dispatch.com @jennsmola
OSU sees increase in cheating

By Jennifer Smola

The Columbus Dispatch

Ohio State University is taking a more focused approach to preventing academic misconduct after seeing a sharp increase in such cases in recent years, a group of Ohio State trustees learned Thursday.

Overall, reported cases of academic misconduct by students have increased 57 percent from the 2015-16 school year through 2017-18, according to a report given to the audit and compliance committee of Ohio State’s Board of Trustees. No total number of violations was provided in the report.

Ohio State is the only university in the Big Ten to require all suspected cases of academic misconduct to be referred to one central office, the Committee on Academic Misconduct, Provost Bruce A. McPherson told the trustees’ committee Thursday. In 2017, that body increased its faculty membership from 18 to 22 because of caseload, the report said.

Because universities handle academic misconduct differently, it can be difficult to compare the number of cases at different institutions, McPherson said, but noted that the topic is one of “break room conversation” within higher education.

“I can tell you anecdotally that our trends are exactly the trends that are mirrored across the nation,” he said.

Digital tools and social media have meant increased opportunities for unauthorized collaboration, the report said, pointing to tools like group messaging app GroupMe and websites like Course Hero that allow students to post notes and old tests from classes.

The report listed two notable cases of academic misconduct in recent years. In one case, the College of Veterinary Medicine identified 85 students suspected of engaging in unauthorized collaboration on take-home exams across multiple courses.

In another, 83 students in a Fisher College of Business course were charged with unauthorized collaboration in graded assignments.

In the veterinary college case, 84 students were found in violation, with sanctions ranging from warnings to suspension. In the business college case, 80 students were found in violation, with 66 put on probation and 14 suspended.

Some colleges and departments, including the College of Veterinary Medicine, have adopted new policies to limit academic misconduct, McPherson said.

The university’s Council of Deans is also working to develop a consistent approach to preventing misconduct across all colleges.

Actions include creating consistent standards for course syllabi, improving student and faculty education programs, evaluating the academic conduct committee’s processes, adopting an online proctoring tool and
developing an online tutorial required of students charged with academic misconduct before their hearings.

McPherson said the university sometimes discovers cases of misconduct where a student intended to be dishonest in their work. But in most cases, students don’t understand what’s expected of them.

“This is the single biggest tension point that students report when they actually enter into the academic misconduct system; that they did not truly understand what the expectations were (for) doing independent work,” McPherson said.

Also Thursday, trustee finance committee members applauded a successful fiscal year for the university, which collected $7 billion in revenue in the fiscal year ending June 30.

The value of the university’s investment pool, which includes gifted endowments, long-term investments and other funds, has grown to $5.2 billion.

That’s up from $4.25 billion at the end of last fiscal year, thanks in large part to proceeds from Ohio State’s energy privatization deal.

Last fiscal year, the university distributed more than $200 million in payments from its investment pool to support academic priorities, educational support and facilities, financial aid, faculty support, the Wexner Medical Center, research, public service and other areas.

Overall, Ohio State has seen a surge in its cash and investments in recent years. Currently, the university has about $9.1 billion in cash and investments, nearly tripling the $3.2 billion it had eight years ago. That $9.1 billion is also double the median amount among Moody’s AA1-rated public comprehensive universities, said Michael Papadakis, interim chief financial officer and treasurer.

The university’s strong financial position didn’t come without risk, nor “by doing business the normal way,” but through innovative ideas, trustee and Columbus Partnership CEO Alex Fischer said.

“It’s a reminder of what happens when you make tough decisions that sometimes are a little riskier in this environment,” Fischer said. jsmola@dispatch.com @jennsmola