College of Engineering Committee on Academic Affairs  
Meeting Minutes 29 March 2012

Attendance:
AVN – Not present (Seth Young)  
BME – Derek Hansford  
CHE – (Jeff Chalmers)  
CEG – (Civil, Environmental, Geomatics) – Hal Walker: Chair  
CSE – Paul Sivilotti  
ECE – George Valco  
ENG PHY – Not present (Richard Hughes)  
FAB – Not present (Gonul Kaletunc)  
ISE – Carolyn Sommerich  
MSE – 
    MSE – Not present (John Morral)  
    WLD – Dave Farson  
MAE – 
    Aero – Not present (Jen Ping Chen)  
    ME – Blaine Lilly: ASAP Rep  
Graduate Student – Kevin Disotell (not present Sushma Santapuri)  
Undergraduate Student – Chelsea Setterlin & Dominic Labanowski  
Secretary – Ed McCaul  
KSA – Holly Griffin (for Jane Murphy)  
Guests – Dave Tomasko, Roberto Rojas-Teran

1. The minutes from the 9 March 2012 meeting were approved as written

2. The committee was informed that the Graduate School will be sending back our BS/PhD proposal as they want some changes to it along with additional information. The committee secretary will revise the proposal and send it to Subcommittee A for their review.

3. Dave Tomasko and Hal Walker gave all members present an article from Inside Higher Education (attached) discussing cheating along with information about the Committee on Academic Misconduct (COAM) (attached).  
   3.1. The committee was informed that the article raises issues about cheating that our faculty need to be aware of. Everyone was requested to share the article with the faculty in their department.  
   3.2. Everyone was encouraged to let their faculty know that they need to be very explicit on what is considered academic misconduct in their syllabus.  
   3.3. The comment was made that faculty are expected to report to COAM any perceived academic misconduct and let their committee decide whether or not it was academic misconduct and, if so, what the punishment will be.  
   3.4. The committee secretary stated that he goes to the COAM hearings as the college’s representative and that if anyone would like to attend one to let him know.
4. Dave Tomasko gave all members present three handouts: Labeling Framework for Course Sections (attached); Semester Calendar Weekly Pattern (attached); and Dual Enrollment Trends (attached).

4.1. Labeling Framework for Course Sections
   4.1.1. There are now three definitions for courses: Distance, Hybrid, or Regular. In addition, there are two definitions for use of technology in courses: Significant or Moderate to Minimal. All courses will be marked with a combination of these indicators.
   4.1.2. The registrar’s office will be reviewing all distance learning courses to make sure that they meet the definition of students enrolled in the course not coming to campus.
   4.1.3. The university is also changing how much an out of state student is charged if they are only taking distance courses. In addition to the standard tuition, there will be a $5.00 charge for distance learning and a $100 charge for the out of state fee. This should make us more competitive in this market.

4.2. Semester Calendar Weekly Pattern
   4.2.1. The key to the weekly semester calendar is that if a course is a summer term course, which means that it is meeting both during the May Session and Summer Session, that the students will not get the week break between the sessions. Also, there is no break between session 1 and session 2 during either the autumn or spring semesters.

4.3. Dual Enrollment Trends
   4.3.1. Dual enrollment students are high school students that are taking college courses while they are in high school.
   4.3.2. The Office of Academic Affairs is worried about the impact dual enrollment will have on us as more students will come to the university with quite a few credit hours. This will impact the number of courses they will take and the revenue they will generate.
   4.3.3. The state legislature is pushing dual enrollment as they would like to see students graduate in three years.
   4.3.4. AP credit will be affected as students will only need to score a 3 rather than a 4, our previous standard.
   4.3.5. The comment was made that dual enrollment will not be available for many high school students in the state as they will not have access to college courses.
   4.3.6. One issue is that high school students will probably not be able to take many engineering courses but will come to OSU thinking that they will be able to graduate in three years. This may cause problems for us.
   4.3.7. There are state level committees working on dual enrollment and Dave Tomasko may be asking for volunteers to serve on these committees. It is important that we are engaged in this process. This is as much a public relations issue as it is an academic issue.
5. Roberto Rojas-Teran informed the committee that the college is working on restructuring our distance learning courses to give our faculty a reason to create a distance learning course. He is looking for input and would like to get ideas on what incentives could be used.

5.1. The comment was made that the infrastructure needs to be built first so that faculty will know what can be delivered. Roberto stated that Mike Compton is conducting a survey on our infrastructure that will help us determine where we should invest money. We are behind other universities in this area and we need to find a niche we can fill.

6. The CCAA Handbook was discussed by the committee.

6.1. George Valco informed the committee that he has received some feedback on the handbook and that one comment was whether or not we should allow transfer credit to count for minors. Currently our policy is silent on this.

6.1.1. The comment was made that we give credit to our degrees for transfer credit.

6.1.2. Derek Hansford stated that no one has asked BME to give them credit for transfer credit for their minor but, they would if someone asked.

6.1.3. Hal Walker stated that Civil would accept transfer credit for its Surveying minor.

6.1.4. The comment was made that we do not allow 100% of a degree to be transfer credit so, does a limit need to be put on transfer credit for a minor.

6.1.5. The comment was made that this committee decided in the past that a minor was an indication that the student has an understanding of a specialized body of knowledge so, using transfer credit fits this policy.

6.1.6. The question was asked as to whether the committee should create a policy or leave it up to the programs. It was decided to leave it up to the programs and that wording to this effect should be added to the policy.

6.2. The suggestion was made that our BS/PhD policy not be included in the handbook until it is fully approved since the Graduate School is sending it back to us.

6.3. George Valco informed the committee that Chemical Engineering has changed their minimum major GPA for graduate to 2.0 up from 1.7. This change will be reflected in the handbook.

6.4. George Valco informed the committee that he is still waiting on the finalized honors policy.

7. Blaine Lilly made a motion that the semester version of our Probation, Dismissal, and Reinstatement Policies be approved. George Valco seconded the motion. The floor was opened for discussion.

7.1. The committee was informed that the policies have been reviewed and approved by the Academic Standards and Progress Subcommittee and that, beyond updating the policies to semesters, the only major change was the addition of a policy for Aviation.

7.2. The comment was made that some students in Civil Engineering have recognized that the courses used to determine their GPA for probation and
dismissal will change under semesters and that some of them have calculated that while they will be on probation under quarters that they will not be on probation under semesters.

7.2.1. The comment was made that the reverse could happen too but, if it does a student could always ask for reinstatement.

7.2.2. The comment was made that the subcommittee has always been biased in favor of the student and that if these issues occur that the benefit of doubt will go for the student.

7.3. There being no further discussion a vote was taken: 9 approved, 0 opposed, and 0 abstentions.

8. The meeting was adjourned at 3:15.
Arizona survey examines student cheating, faculty responses

[1]

Submitted by Allie Grasgreen [2] on March 16, 2012 - 3:00am

PHOENIX -- Eighty-four percent of students at a public research university believe students who cheat should be punished, yet two of every three admit to having cheated themselves. Most of the cheating students admit to involves homework, not tests, and they see academic misconduct applying differently to those two kinds of work.

These findings were part of a study presented here this week at the annual convention of NASPA: Student Affairs Professionals in Higher Education. Depending on how much you buy into the "Dirty Rotten Scoundrels" theory -- the idea, for which this session was named, that faculty believe students are "just a bunch of cheaters" -- the findings may or may not come as a surprise. But either way, those results, coupled with the fact that many instructors devote little if any time to discussing academic integrity, led the researchers to an obvious conclusion: setting clear expectations, and repeating them early and often, is crucial.

"It's about communicating clearly in the classroom and spending time on the topic," said Angela Baldasare, divisional manager of assessment and data analysis at the University of Arizona, about clarifying expectations and increasing the intrinsic values of assignments, "so that there's something more to it than just a grade."

The study into the frequency and type of offenses, and the faculty policies and responses, surveyed more than 2,000 students and 600 instructors on the Arizona campus.

It found the highest rates of cheating among fraternity and sorority members and international students, the latter of whom were most likely to use technology to cheat. Fewer than 10 percent of Arizona students said they've used technology to get answers during an exam, but more international than American students admitted to obtaining test answers online (21 versus 11 percent), having copied material from the Internet for a writing assignment without citing the source (23 versus 13 percent), and sending or receiving text messages during an exam (12 versus 3 percent). Cheating was reported least among students receiving need-based aid, and non-degree seeking and first-generation students. (The more education a student's parents had, the more likely he or she was to have cheated.)

Freshmen were least likely to have cheated, and the likelihood that students had cheated rose from
year to year at an almost linear, small but significant rate. (Interestingly, under most circumstances, the opposite was true when students were asked how likely they think they would be to cheat in the future.)

"I really think this was about a maturation effect," Baldasare said. "The likelihood of 'Have you ever cheated' increases as you spend more time in the college environment."

Sixty percent of students indicated they'd cheated on homework, and 19 percent had cheated on an exam (30 percent cheated on both).

"Homework seems to be the issue where it's just, in students' minds, less of a big deal. That this is not a high-stakes evaluation of their performance," Baldasare said. "That sometimes classroom guidelines are less clear on homework, or what's permissible with homework, than it is for exams or papers." For instance, students don't blink an eye at rushing to copy homework or compare answers right before class.

While 97 percent of faculty reported including statements about academic integrity their syllabuses, only 83 percent of students said all their instructors did so. Nearly three-quarters of faculty said their syllabuses defined specific behaviors that constitute violations, and half of students said all their instructors did. Sixty-seven percent of faculty said their syllabus explained the consequences of cheating; 52 percent said all their instructors did.

It was "concerning" that a full 16 percent of instructors don't discuss academic integrity even once in class, said Kendal Washington White, senior associate dean of students at Arizona.

In a rather surprising finding, and to the dismay of the presenters, 41 percent of instructors said they "ensured" the class knew when a cheater was caught.

"We don't want them to do this," Washington White said. She described one case where a professor believed a student was cheating on an exam and instead of pulling him aside, tore up his exam in front of the entire class. It's clear expectations are key, she said, and humiliating students does not achieve that end.

Four in five faculty have reported at least one violation, and of those who have, 60 percent said they typically do so at least once a semester. Yet, most faculty don't consider cheating a "rampant" problem, Baldasare said, and don't think most students do it.

It appears that students are more likely to cheat out of perceived necessity than simply because they can get away with it.

The most dire circumstances were the ones under which students said they would be most likely to cheat: facing disqualification from the university or program of study (about: 35 percent on average), when a scholarship was at risk (about 38 percent), when they ran out of time on an assignment (30 percent), or to maintain a grade point average (28 percent). Students are less inclined to cheat just because other students are doing it (15 percent) or the professor ignores it (20 percent).

"There is a high-pressure environment that's acting upon the students, and that seems to be, in their minds, what matters more even than the normative expectations of their peers," Baldasare said.

In something of a paradox, only 28 percent of students reported paraphrasing text without citing it, but plagiarism is the most common conduct violation – Arizona students are up to four times more likely to be caught plagiarizing than cheating in other ways, Baldasare said. Most of the time, Washington White said, students who plagiarize simply haven't been taught how to cite properly.
(That's part of the reason why she worries about professors relying too much on software, like TurnItIn, that detects likely plagiarism. "There's an automatic assumption that the student has plagiarized," Washington White said. "I always caution instructors to not just say, 'A equals B,' that you really need to take a look at that work.")

Given that students at the start of their collegiate careers are both less likely to have cheated yet more likely to think they eventually will, it's important to reach them at the outset, Washington White said. Arizona is now including academic integrity workshops during new-student orientation, where students hear specific examples of violations so students know exactly what's permissible and what's not. At convocation, freshmen get another reminder of these standards. Officials have sharpened their marketing materials to make them more accessible and appealing to students, using a humorous rather than threatening tone.

On the faculty side, in addition to encouraging them to discuss standards, violations and consequences in class, officials are trying to ease the reporting burden. At Arizona, where instructors are responsible for reporting violations and determining the penalty, many are reluctant to formally document a breach because of the time investment it requires. So this summer, the administration is moving the reporting process online. (In another finding, men and tenure-track faculty were less likely to report violations than were women and non-tenure track faculty.)

And as the session wound down just days after the National Collegiate Athletic Association slapped the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill with scholarship reductions and a post-season ban for violations including academic fraud, one audience member asked whether the survey found any significant differences in the behavior of athletes. It didn't, but the presenters were unsure what to make of that.

"I'm not going to say that's the end of the story," Baldasare said. But Washington White speculated that athletes aren't necessarily cheating more, they just get more backlash when they do.

"I'm not sure that that is being handled equitably," she said. "There's not more of the athletes doing it, but they're higher profile so you're going to pay more attention to it."


Links:
What is academic misconduct?

The university's Code of Student Conduct defines academic misconduct as "any activity that tends to compromise the academic integrity of the University, or subvert the educational process."

While many people associate academic misconduct with "cheating," the term encompasses a wider scope of student behaviors which include, but are not limited to, the following:

- Violation of course rules;
- Violation of program regulations;
- Knowingly providing or receiving information during a course exam or program assignment;
- Possession and/or use of unauthorized materials during a course exam or program assignment;
- Knowingly providing or using assistance in the laboratory, on field work, or on a course assignment, unless such assistance has been authorized specifically by the course instructor or, where appropriate, a project/research supervisor;
- Submission of work not performed in a course: This includes (but is not limited to) instances where a student fabricates and/or falsifies data or information for a laboratory experiment (i.e., a "dry lab") or other academic assignment. It also includes instances where a student submits data or information (such as a lab report or term paper) from one course to satisfy the requirements of another course, unless submission of such work is permitted by the instructor of the course or supervisor of the research for which the work is being submitted;
- Submitting plagiarized work for a course/program assignment;
- Falsification, fabrication, or dishonesty in conducting or reporting laboratory (research) results;
- Serving as or asking another student to serve as a substitute (a "ringer") while taking an exam;
- Alteration of grades in an effort to change earned credit or a grade;
- Alteration and/or unauthorized use of university forms or records.

Cases of alleged academic misconduct are adjudicated through a formal hearing process by the Committee on Academic Misconduct (COAM), a standing committee of the University Senate. To ensure a broad representation on the Committee, COAM draws its members from throughout the university's academic community: faculty (appointed by University Senate), graduate students (appointed by the Council of Graduate Students), and undergraduate students (appointed by Undergraduate Student Government).

Many of the most common questions regarding the academic misconduct process at The Ohio State University are answered below.

Why should cases of alleged academic misconduct be reported to the Committee on Academic Misconduct?
One of the primary duties and responsibilities of the Committee on Academic Misconduct is to "investigate...all reported cases of student academic misconduct, with the exception of cases in a professional college having a published honor code, and decide upon suitable disciplinary action," and "instructors shall report all instances of alleged misconduct to the committee" (University Faculty Rule 3335-5-487[B1]). Aside from this rule, there are several additional reasons why faculty should report all instances of alleged misconduct to the Committee.

When a case of alleged academic misconduct is brought to the Committee:

- The case is resolved by an impartial hearing panel;
- The panel uses a consistent standard in reviewing alleged violations of the Code of Student Conduct;
- The panel uses a consistent standard when applying sanctions;
- The panel has the authority to determine if a student has a prior history of misconduct and to take this into consideration when sanctioning a student; and
- The panel has the authority to authorize grade sanctions for courses in which students have violated the Code of Student Conduct.
- The Committee has the authority to impose other sanctions as necessary to maintain the academic integrity of The Ohio State University.

What kind of information about academic misconduct (academic integrity) should I include in my course syllabus?

The Committee on Academic Misconduct (COAM) recommends that every faculty member, instructor, and graduate teaching associate who is teaching a course prepare and distribute (or make available) to all students a course syllabus. (See also, "What steps can students take to avoid and instructors take to prevent academic misconduct?") Furthermore, COAM recommends that the course syllabus contain a statement concerning “academic misconduct” or “academic integrity.” The Ohio State University does not have a standardized statement on academic misconduct that instructors can use in their syllabi. Thus, COAM has prepared the following statement, which course instructors are free to use (with or without modification) for their syllabi.

Please note that this is a generic statement, which may or may not fit the needs of your course(s). Please read the following carefully before use and edit as necessary to fit your specific needs. If there are additional policies or guidelines that apply specifically to the course(s) that you teach, please include these policies and/or guidelines in your syllabus.

(Click here for a Word document containing the statement below. You may "cut and paste" from this document as necessary.)

**ACADEMIC INTEGRITY (ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT)**

Academic integrity is essential to maintaining an environment that fosters excellence in teaching, research, and other educational and scholarly activities. Thus, The Ohio State University and the
Committee on Academic Misconduct (COAM) expect that all students have read and understand the University’s *Code of Student Conduct*, and that all students will complete all academic and scholarly assignments with fairness and honesty. Students must recognize that failure to follow the rules and guidelines established in the University’s *Code of Student Conduct* and this syllabus may constitute “Academic Misconduct.”

The Ohio State University’s *Code of Student Conduct* (Section 3335-23-04) defines academic misconduct as: “Any activity that tends to compromise the academic integrity of the University, or subvert the educational process.” Examples of academic misconduct include (but are not limited to) plagiarism, collusion (unauthorized collaboration), copying the work of another student, and possession of unauthorized materials during an examination. Ignorance of the University’s *Code of Student Conduct* is never considered an “excuse” for academic misconduct, so I recommend that you review the *Code of Student Conduct* and, specifically, the sections dealing with academic misconduct.

If I suspect that a student has committed academic misconduct in this course, I am obligated by University Rules to report my suspicions to the Committee on Academic Misconduct. If COAM determines that you have violated the University’s *Code of Student Conduct* (i.e., committed academic misconduct), the sanctions for the misconduct could include a failing grade in this course and suspension or dismissal from the University.

If you have any questions about the above policy or what constitutes academic misconduct in this course, please contact me.

Other sources of information on academic misconduct (integrity) to which you can refer include:

- The Committee on Academic Misconduct web pages (COAM Home)
- *Ten Suggestions for Preserving Academic Integrity* (Ten Suggestions)
- *Eight Cardinal Rules of Academic Integrity* (www.northwestern.edu/uacc/8cards.html)

**What steps can students avoid and instructors take to prevent academic misconduct?**

The Ohio State University represents a large and extremely diverse academic community. Faculty and students come from diverse academic, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds, and their interests cover hundreds of academic disciplines. Thus, it’s not surprising to find that faculty and students often have different ideas of what types of student behavior constitute "cheating" and other types of academic misconduct, so the Committee on Academic Misconduct believes firmly in the proverb:

**An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.**
That is, faculty must be proactive in explaining and students must be proactive in understanding what types of behavior constitute academic misconduct in each course, laboratory, field setting, academic program/discipline, and/or other research or scholarly activity. **Note that the onus rests with both faculty and students.**

The following list includes some (but certainly not all) of the things a course/laboratory instructor, teaching associate, or project supervisor might do to increases students’ awareness and understanding of academic misconduct:

- Read and follow the "Ten Principles of Academic Integrity for Faculty."
- Provide in your course syllabus (or, as appropriate, other materials made available to students) a clear description of academic misconduct. In particular, tell students what types of behavior are and are not permissible in your course or on a particular assignment or type of activity. At the very least, instructors should remind students to review the section on academic misconduct in the University's Code of Student Conduct. (See also, "What kind of information about academic misconduct (academic integrity) should I include in my course syllabus?")
- Include in your syllabus (or tell students about) Ohio State University’s *Ten Suggestions for Preserving Academic Integrity* and/or Northwestern University's *Eight Cardinal Rules of Academic Integrity*.
- For writing assignments, including master's theses and doctoral dissertations or other graduate-level documents, review with students the definition of plagiarism. If possible, provide students with explicit information regarding (1) the differences among quotations, paraphrasing, public domain, and their original thoughts, (2) what resources they can and can not use, and (3) how each of these resources should be cited in a writing assignment.
- The Internet provides students with a wealth of information; it also provide the Committee on Academic Misconduct with many cases of alleged plagiarism. Depending on the course you are teaching and the type of assignment, an extra warning about using the Internet might be warranted.
- If you receive any e-mail messages requesting course information (e.g., examinations, keys to examinations, etc.), authenticate the message's source before sending the information. The Committee has seen several instances where students have established "bogus" e-mail accounts and misrepresented themselves as instructors and/or TA's.
- In many courses or other assignments/projects, collaboration among students is permissible and expected. For those courses (or assignments) in which collaboration among students is permissible, faculty should explain carefully where acceptable collaboration ends and academic misconduct (collusion) begins.
- Administer examinations and quizzes in such a manner that minimizes the possibility of students copying from each other and/or using unauthorized materials. For example:
  - Separate students during examinations. If necessary, schedule your examinations in a different room (a room with a larger capacity) from that where you normally hold class.
  - Use multiple forms of the same test, making sure that adjacent students have different forms.
o Arrange for proctors to help you administer examinations and quizzes and monitor students' behavior during the examinations and quizzes.

- When administering an examination or quiz, count everything carefully, particularly the number of students taking the examination and the number of examinations turned in for grading.
- Photocopy examinations or answer sheets before returning them to students.
- In larger courses where you might not recognize all of the students, check students' ID's to verify their identifies.
- If you post information on the Internet, delete the files when they are no longer needed. Even if you remove the links to old files, the files might be found using a search engine.
- Supervisors of courses, assignments, and projects (whichever may apply) should make students aware of pertinent policies related to the use of intellectual property, copyright, and other relevant issues, as appropriate.

As noted above, students must also take a proactive role in preventing academic misconduct.

"Ignorance is no excuse."

If a student has any questions about what is or is not permissible in a course, an assignment, or other scholarly activity, he/she should ask the faculty member in charge of the course or the supervisor in charge of the activity! Students should also read Ohio State University's Ten Suggestions for Preserving Academic Integrity and Northwestern University's Eight Cardinal Rules of Academic Integrity.

If I suspect that a student is violating the Code of Student Conduct (e.g., is in the process of "cheating" during an exam), what should I do?

If you suspect that a student is violating the Code of Student Conduct, you should take the following steps:

- Observe the student's behavior carefully and write down what you saw;
- If possible, have another person verify your observations, especially in a testing situation, and have this person write down what he/she saw;
- Collect any other information that might be relevant to the alleged academic misconduct, such as examinations, answer sheets, notes, or other materials;
- Include in your observations the date, location, and time of the alleged misconduct, as well as the student's name;
- If the faculty member teaching the course is not present when the alleged misconduct occurs, contact the faculty member immediately.

If I suspect that a student has violated the Code of Student Conduct (e.g., has already turned in an assignment, examination, or quiz, etc.), what should I do?

If possible, contact the student and make arrangements to meet with him/her. This meeting should be held in private, and a witness (e.g., another faculty member, a department/college administrator, a teaching associate, etc.) should be present. Explain to the student that you
believe that he/she has violated the Code of Student Conduct, and explain the basis of your suspicion. For example, "I believe that you violated the Code of Student Conduct by altering your exam and turning it in for regrading." Tell the student that you are required by University Rules to report these allegations to the Committee on Academic Misconduct, and that the Committee will determine whether or not he/she has violated the Code of Student Conduct.

If the student wishes to comment on the allegations of academic misconduct during this meeting, he/she should be permitted to do so. You can include in your report to the Committee any comments that the student makes. However, the primary purpose of the meeting between you and the student is to inform the student of the allegation of academic misconduct; you should not interrogate the student.

The Committee on Academic Misconduct recommends that you inform a student of an allegation of academic misconduct before submitting the allegation to the Committee. However, the Committee also realizes that it is sometimes difficult to contact students, especially if the student has completed the course, project, or activity in which the misconduct allegedly occurred, so the meeting with a student is not mandatory. The Committee on Academic Misconduct will accept and adjudicate cases of alleged academic misconduct even if this preliminary meeting between student and instructor is not held.

In cases involving alleged academic misconduct by a graduate student, consultation with the chairperson of the student's graduate program and/or the Graduate School might be warranted prior to contacting the student or COAM.

Students often want to know how an allegation of academic misconduct will affect their enrollment or grade in a course. Thus, for allegations related to a course, you should tell the student that (1) he/she is permitted to continue in the course without prejudice and (2) his/her final grade will be determined after the allegations of academic misconduct are adjudicated.

**What happens when the allegations of misconduct involve a graduating senior?**

If allegations of misconduct are made against a graduating senior (especially if it's late in the quarter), the Committee on Academic Misconduct can facilitate the hearing process. Even if the allegations are made during the 10th (or final) week of the quarter, the Committee can hear and resolve the case during the early part of the following week.

**I have a "hold" on my records. Why? how do I find out who put it there? Why? How do I get it removed?**

There are a number of possible reasons why there's a "hold" on your records, but in a majority of cases it's because someone at the University is trying to get your attention. By putting a "hold" on your records, the University forces you to contact whoever put the "hold" on your records so you can provide that person with whatever information he/she needs. If the Committee on Academic Misconduct (COAM) is unable to contact or obtain a current local address for a student, COAM will often put a "hold" on that student's records. This forces the student to
contact COAM and provide the necessary information. Once the student provides the required information, COAM removes the "hold."

If you have been suspended from the University for Academic Misconduct (or some other violation of the University's Code of Student Conduct), the Registrar's Office will put a "hold" on your records. This is done to prevent you from registering for classes while you are suspended. Once your suspension has been satisfied, the Registrar's Office will remove the "hold" from your records.

Who Put it There?

If you have a "hold" on your records and want to find out why or have it removed, the first thing you need to do is find out who placed the "hold." The simplest way to do this is to telephone (614-292-8500) or visit the Registrar's Office (located in the student Academic Services Building) and ask who placed the "hold" on your records. Once you have determined which University office placed the "hold" on your records, you can contact that office for additional information.

How do I get it removed?

That depends on which office put the "hold" on your records and why. The best thing to do is contact the University office that placed the "hold" and find out what you need to do to get the "hold" removed.

If the "hold" was placed by the Committee on Academic Misconduct, or if you were suspended from the University by COAM, you should contact COAM at 614-292-7262.

How do I report a case of alleged academic misconduct? What do I send and where do I send it?

What do I send?

This depends on the nature of the alleged misconduct, but you should submit all original documents (e.g., examinations, answer sheets, lab reports, etc.) and a copy of the course syllabus to the Committee on Academic Misconduct. If the allegations include plagiarism, include a copy of the student's work and the work that you believe was plagiarized, and highlight the sections that you believe were plagiarized in both the original and the student's work. If the allegations include collaboration among students, submit the work of all of the students, and explain the basis of your allegation. If the allegations include possession and/or use of unauthorized materials, include the unauthorized materials.

When submitting this information, please remember that:

- The members of a panel hearing a case of alleged academic misconduct may come from diverse academic disciplines. Thus, unless the nature of the allegation is clear, you should
provide the panel members with a concise, written explanation of the reason(s) for the allegations of academic misconduct.

- The materials that you send constitute the "evidence" the panel will consider in determining whether or not the student has violated to Code and the sanctions. Additional evidence may not be introduced during a hearing.

All cases submitted to the Committee on Academic Misconduct should be accompanied by a letter from the department chairperson or program director (or other appropriate administrative officer).

**Where do I send these materials?**

Committee on Academic Misconduct  
33 W. 11th Avenue, Room 107  
CAMPUS

Send electronic submissions to: coam@osu.edu

These materials should be sent to the Committee in a way that maintains confidentiality.

COAM has prepared a template that provides step-by-step instructions for (1) what to report and (2) how to report it. Click [here](#) to download the template and instructions from completing it.

**If I report a student to COAM, how do I handle the student's course grade?**

The student should be allowed to continue in the course without prejudice. However, if the allegation of academic misconduct is not resolved before the end of the quarter, you should report a final grade of "I" (incomplete) for the student. For the "alternate grade," you should report the grade the student would have received if he/she had not been accused of academic misconduct.

**What happens with my grade if I am accused of academic misconduct?**

There are a number of possible answers to this question, depending on the circumstances and timing of the allegations.

If you are accused of academic misconduct while enrolled in a course, you are assumed to be "not in violation of the Code of Student Conduct" until the allegations are resolved. This means that you are permitted to continue in the course without prejudice; you should continue attending class, and you should complete all course assignments. If the allegations of academic misconduct are resolved before the quarter ends and you are found to be "not in violation of the Code of Student Conduct," your final grade in the course will be calculated as if nothing had happened. However, if the allegations of academic misconduct are resolved before the quarter ends and you are found "in violation of the Code of Student Conduct," the instructor will calculate your final grade in the course based on the grade sanction authorized by the hearing panel or officer.
If you are accused of academic misconduct, you may withdraw from a course if you want. However, if you withdraw from a course and are found subsequently to be "in violation of the Code of Student Conduct," COAM has the authority to re-enroll you and give you a failing grade in the course. In other words, if you are found "in violation of the Code of Student Conduct," you could receive a failing grade in the course even though you withdrew from the course.

If you are accused of academic misconduct and the allegations of academic misconduct are not resolved before the quarter ends, the instructor must turn in a final grade for you. The grade will be either a letter grade (i.e., A, B, C, etc.) or an incomplete (I). If the instructor reports a letter grade for your final course grade, **this does not mean that the allegations of academic misconduct have been dropped or resolved**, and you should recognize that your final course grade can be changed if you are found "in violation of the Code of Student Conduct."

If the instructor reports your grade as an incomplete, the instructor must also report an alternate letter grade. In such cases, an "I" will appear on your grade report, but the alternate letter grade will not be indicated. If you receive an incomplete grade in a course, the alternate letter grade takes effect automatically six weeks after the quarter ends, and the Registrar's Office notifies you of this change by e-mail. For example, if an instructor gives you an incomplete in a course with an alternate grade of "B," your grade for the course will appear initially as an "I." If nothing happens to change your alternate letter grade during the first six weeks of the subsequent quarter, the "I" will change to a "B," and you will be notified of this change by the Registrar's Office; this is "standard operating procedure" for the Registrar's Office. You must recognize that this does not mean that the allegations of academic misconduct have been dropped or somehow resolved. Moreover, if you are eventually found to be "in violation of the Code of Student Conduct," your final grade in the course (a "B" in this example) could be changed as a result of a grade sanction.

If an instructor reports your grade as an incomplete and the allegations of academic misconduct are not resolved within six weeks of the subsequent quarter, the instructor has the option of extending the incomplete grade. If this occurs, your letter grade in the course will change from "I" to "IX." As noted in the above paragraph, this does not mean that the allegations of academic misconduct have been dropped or resolved. The "IX" simply means that your incomplete grade has been extended, and that your final grade in the course will be determined once the allegations of academic misconduct are resolved.

**What happens after a case of alleged academic misconduct is reported to the Committee?**

Once a case of alleged academic misconduct is received, the following series of events is set into motion:

- The Committee's Coordinator verifies that the allegations fall within the Committee's jurisdiction and determines the specific charges against the student (e.g., plagiarism, unauthorized collaboration, use or attempted use of unauthorized material during an examination, etc.).
The student is notified of the allegations of academic misconduct and the charges. The student is also notified that he/she has the right to review and/or obtain a copy of the information that lead to the allegations of academic misconduct.

- The student is invited to meet with the Committee's Coordinator to discuss the allegations and hearing process, and to ask any questions that he/she might have.
- All individuals scheduled for the hearing are notified of the hearing time and date.
- The hearing is held.
- The student is notified of the Committee's decision. If the student is found "in violation of the Code of Student Conduct," the student is notified of the sanction and the appeal process is explained.

What are academic misconduct "charges?"

When allegations of academic misconduct arise, a student often does not know or understand what he/she has allegedly done wrong. Since the Committee desires that the hearing process be an educational process, the Coordinator charges the student with violating the Code using terminology that explains the nature of the behavior that lead to the allegations. The information below includes most of the formal charges used by COAM when charging a student with academic misconduct. As the nature of some of the charges may not be clear to students or include several different types of dishonest behavior, some charges are described in more detail than others. If appropriate, the Coordinator of the Committee may develop charges other than those listed below to describe the allegations.

Plagiarism (submitting plagiarized work in fulfillment of an academic assignment):
Plagiarism is the representation of another's work or ideas as one's own. It includes the unacknowledged verbatim use and/or paraphrasing of another person's work, and/or the inappropriate unacknowledged use of another person's ideas. For the purposes of academic misconduct, plagiarism of published resources (e.g., books, journals, etc.), the Internet, or other printed/electronic resources (e.g., course syllabi, instructors' manuals, etc.) is considered a violation of the University's Code of Student Conduct.

Alteration and resubmission of course materials in an attempt to change the earned grade or credit: This includes altering in any way a laboratory report, a writing assignment, an examination, a quiz, or any other course material after it has been graded and submitting it again for grading in an attempt to change the earned grade or score.

Forgery: This includes any instance where a student alters a University or other form (or record), or where a student produces and/or submits to a faculty member, instructor, teaching associate, or other University official a forged, counterfeited, or fraudulent form, document or other information. Examples of forgery include, but are not limited to:

- Unauthorized alteration and/or use of any University or other type of form or document;
- Counterfeiting or unauthorized copying of any University or other type of form or document;
- Any action where a student attempts to misrepresent himself/herself as somebody else. This may take the form of:
- Forging of a signature
- Establishing "bogus" e-mail or other types of electronic messaging accounts or otherwise changing electronic messages in an attempt to misrepresent oneself;

**Acting as a substitute ("ringer") for another student during an examination or other course activity:** The nature of this charge is self-explanatory.

**Requesting that another student take your place during an examination or other course activity:** The nature of this charge is self-explanatory.

**Copying or attempting to copy the work of another student in an unauthorized manner and misrepresenting it or attempting to misrepresent it as one's own work:** This includes, but is not necessarily limited to, one student copying or attempting to copy the work of another student, and it includes any form of copying (or attempting to copy), such as:

- One student copying or attempting to copy answers or information from another student during a test, quiz, or other course assignment;
- One student copying or attempting to copy another student's assignment with the intent of submitting it (or actually submitting it) as his/her own work;
  - The type of information copied and the method used to copy the information are irrelevant.

**Unauthorized Collaboration/Collusion:** This includes any instance where two or more students work together and/or share information in a manner that is unauthorized, deceitful, and/or fraudulent.

**Possession and/or use of unauthorized materials during an examination or other course activity:** The nature of this charge is self-explanatory.

**Submission of work not performed in a course:** This includes instances where a student fabricates and/or falsifies data or information for a laboratory experiment (i.e., a "dry lab") or other course assignment, or where a student submits data or information (such as a lab report) from a previous course to satisfy the requirements of the course in which he/she is enrolled currently.

**Failure to comply with course/program policies and/or requirements:** This includes instances where a student fails to follow or otherwise subverts published policies and/or requirements for the course or program in which he/she is enrolled.

**Engaging in activities that place other students at an unfair advantage, such as taking, hiding, or altering source material, altering source material, or manipulating a grading system.** Examples of such dishonest conduct include, but are not limited to:

- Stealing reserved reading materials from the library;
- Stealing or altering the labels on laboratory (teaching or research) specimens;
• Stealing or altering the notes, laboratory reports, or other course assignments of another student.

What's the difference between "fair use" and plagiarism?

The doctrine of fair use allows the limited use of copyrighted material for certain educational, scholarly and research purposes without the permission of the copyright owner. It applies to any copyrighted material regardless of source, including the Internet. If you photocopy a page from one of your textbooks or print a page from a copyrighted Internet site for certain educational, scholarly or research purposes, your actions may fall under the doctrine of fair use. The copyright laws give you permission to copy the work (with certain limitations), even though the owner of the copyright did not.

Plagiarism is "the representation of another's work 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" (The Ohio State University Code of Student Conduct). This means that if you use another person's work when completing any academic assignment, regardless of whether or not it's copyrighted and regardless of whether it is paraphrased or a direct quotation, you must give that person appropriate credit (provide a citation and use quotation marks, if appropriate). If you use another person's work (intellectual property) and do not give that person credit, you are representing that person's work as your own.

Consider the following example:

Bill copied five pages of copyrighted information from an Internet site for his history term paper. When Bill pasted this information into his term paper, he did not use quotation marks and he did not include a citation. Bill was charged with plagiarism. During his hearing before the Committee on Academic Misconduct, Bill argued that what he did was acceptable under the doctrine of fair use and, therefore, he did not violate the University's Code of Student Conduct.

For purposes of copyright law, Bill's assertion regarding the doctrine of fair use may be correct. That is, the doctrine of fair use may allow him to copy and use copyrighted material in his academic assignments (with certain limitations) without committing copyright infringement. Moreover, the doctrine of fair use does not necessarily require Bill to use quotation marks or cite the source of the copied material.

However, Bill's assertion that he did not violate the University's Code of Student Conduct is incorrect. Because Bill did not use quotation marks and did not cite the source of his information, he passed this work off as his own. This is plagiarism. Even if Bill paraphrased the information that he copied (in which case quotation marks are not required) but did not cite it, it's still plagiarism. Thus, Bill did violate the University's Code of Student Conduct.

What can a student do to prepare for a hearing?

There are a number of ways in which a student can prepare for a hearing. When a student is notified of the allegations of academic misconduct, he/she is given the opportunity to meet with
the Committee's Coordinator. If a student takes advantage of this opportunity, the Coordinator explains to the student the hearing process and answers any questions that he/she might have. (The hearing is held regardless of whether or not the student has a preliminary meeting with the Coordinator.) The Coordinator also informs the student of other ways in which he/she can prepare for the hearing, such as:

- A student may invite to the hearing an advisor or support person. This might be a friend, an academic counselor, or a parent, etc. The advisor is not permitted to participate in the hearing process (i.e., address the Committee), but the advisor may advise the student during the hearing. Students who are not proficient in English are welcome to invite a translator as their support person.
- A student may invite to the hearing any individuals who (1) may have witnessed the alleged academic misconduct and/or (2) may have information pertinent to the allegations of academic misconduct.
- Before the hearing, a student may prepare and submit to the Committee a written statement. Alternatively, a student may prepare a written statement and read it during the hearing. Some students find this a very useful exercise, as it gives them an opportunity before the hearing begins to think about and express their thoughts.
- A student has the right to question the instructor who has made the allegation of academic misconduct. In advance of the hearing, a student receives a copy of all the materials that were submitted by the instructor in support of the allegation of academic misconduct. Thus, a student has ample opportunity to review this material and develop any questions that he/she thinks might provide useful information for the Committee.

**What happens if I (a student accused of academic misconduct) cannot attend my hearing or I have a conflict?**

The Committee on Academic Misconduct will not check your class or personal schedule before scheduling a hearing. Thus, it is possible that your hearing time will conflict with your class or personal schedule. If this occurs, you may request a continuance for "due cause." If this applies to you, please read the following carefully.

What is "due cause" (i.e., what will COAM accept as a justification for cancelling and rescheduling your hearing)?

- If you have a class assignment or activity for which you must be present (e.g., an examination or quiz) and which cannot be completed at another time.
- If you are working and cannot change your work schedule.
- If you will be out of town and cannot reschedule your trip.

What is not "due cause" (i.e., what won't COAM accept as a justification for cancelling and rescheduling your hearing)?

- If you have a class scheduled during that time.
- If your advisor, support person or witnesses cannot attend at that time.
If I elect to do so, how do I request a continuance? Your request for a continuance must be
submitted in writing to the Coordinator of COAM at least two working days before the hearing is
scheduled to take place. Requests received less than two working days before a scheduled
hearing will not be considered. Your request must indicate why you are requesting a
continuance, and it should also contain any necessary documentation to support your request (or,
you should be prepared to provide such documentation, if requested to do so). For example, if
you must work or take an examination, you should provide (or be prepared to provide) a letter
from your employer or instructor. If your continuance is approved, your hearing will be
rescheduled.

Please note the following if you are considering a continuance:

- You are entitled to only one continuance! If you request a continuance and the request is
  approved (i.e., your hearing is rescheduled), you will not be granted a second continuance
  for any reason. Thus, if you have a scheduling conflict that might be resolved in another
  way (e.g., by asking your instructor if you can take an exam or quiz at another time rather
  than rescheduling your hearing), COAM recommends that you try to resolve the conflict
  in this manner.
- If you request a continuance and it is approved, your hearing could be delayed. At best, a
  rescheduling of your hearing will result in a delay of at least two weeks (since we must
give you 10 days notice). At worst, a rescheduling of your hearing could result in a delay
  of one or two months. Thus, requesting a continuance should be avoided if you want to
  resolve the allegations of academic misconduct as quickly as possible.

What kind of evidence will the panel consider during a hearing?

The procedures of the Committee are not as formal as those existing in a court of law, but they
are designed to ensure fairness. Also, unlike decisions in a court of law, which must be based on
evidence that is "beyond a reasonable doubt," decisions of the Committee are based on a
"preponderance of the evidence." Students are presumed "not in violation of the Code," and, to
ensure fairness, the panel will consider virtually any type of evidence that is submitted by the
student or instructor. In addition to the materials submitted by the instructor when the case is
reported and any information provided by the instructor and/or student during the formal hearing,
the Committee will consider:

- A written statement provided by the student prior to the hearing;
- Statements provided by witnesses who attend the hearing;
- Written statements by potential witnesses who are unable to attend the hearing;
  - Such statements must be authenticated in some manner (e.g., notarized or sent via
    a secure e-mail account);
- Statements from individuals who are invited to the hearing by the panel or Coordinator
  and who have special expertise; and
- Other forms of evidence that the instructor and/or student believe might be appropriate.

What is the standard of proof used in academic misconduct hearings?
The standard or level of proof required to find a student in violation of the Code of Student Conduct is a preponderance of the evidence. Known also as a balance of probabilities or "greater weight of the evidence," a preponderance of evidence is defined as follows: "The greater weight of the evidence required in a civil (non-criminal) lawsuit for the trier of fact (jury or judge without a jury) to decide in favor of one side or the other. This preponderance is based on the more convincing evidence and its probable truth or accuracy, and not on the amount of evidence. Thus, one clearly knowledgeable witness may provide a preponderance of evidence over a dozen witnesses with hazy testimony, or a signed agreement with definite terms may outweigh opinions or speculation about what the parties intended" (Law.com).

Who attends a panel hearing?

In addition to the student, the following individuals are scheduled to attend a hearing:

- The hearing panel, which consists of at least four (4) members of the Committee on Academic Misconduct. Of these four members, at least two must be faculty members and one must be a student. Only members of the hearing panel vote to determine if a student is "in violation of the Code of Student Conduct" and, if the student is found in violation, the sanction.
- An advisor or support person and/or any witnesses invited by the student;
- The person who reported the allegation of misconduct, most often a course instructor. Teaching associates, graders, lecturers, etc., who may have information about the alleged misconduct, are also invited;
- A representative from the student's college of enrollment;
- The Coordinator for the Committee on Academic Misconduct; and
- Any other individuals who might be able to provide information that will help the Committee reach its decision.

(See, also, the section on administrative decisions.)

What happens during a panel hearing?

To insure that a student understands why he/she has been called before a panel of the Committee, a hearing always begins with the panel's chairperson informing the student that he/she has been accused of violating the Code of Student Conduct, as well as the specific charges against the student (e.g., plagiarism). The panel's chairperson asks the student if he/she has received written notification of the allegations, if the student understands the allegations, and if the student agrees or disagrees with the allegations.

The individual who reported the allegations of misconduct (usually the course instructor) presents his/her evidence, and the student is then given an opportunity to present his/her side of the story (including the presentation of any witnesses). Members of the panel then ask questions of the instructor and/or student in order to get a better understanding of the situation that resulted in the allegation. During this time, the student and instructor also may ask each other questions. When the panel members, student, and instructor have no more questions, the student is
permitted to present a final statement before the panel considers the evidence. The student and instructor then leave the hearing room.

The members of the panel discuss the evidence presented by the student and instructor and determine if the student has violated the Code of Student Conduct. If the student is found "not in violation of the Code," he/she is invited immediately into the hearing room and informed of the panel's decision. If the student is found "in violation of the Code," the panel determines an appropriate sanction. The student is then brought into the hearing room, and the decision is read.

What is an "administrative decision?"

If the student agrees with the allegations of academic misconduct (i.e., admits to violating the Code of Student Conduct), he/she may elect to have the case resolved as an administrative decision. The student must waive his/her right to a panel hearing, and the case is resolved without a formal hearing. The student may submit a written statement explaining his/her view of the alleged incident, and a hearing officer (a member of COAM) assigns the sanction. If a student elects to have an administrative decision, the only basis for an appeal is that the sanction imposed is grossly disproportionate to the violation committed. Since a hearing is not held, administrative decisions can be made and the case can be resolved quickly.

How long does it take to resolve an allegation of academic misconduct?

The time required to resolve an allegation of academic misconduct varies considerably among cases. Based on cases resolved during the past several years, the average length of time to resolve a case is approximately 40 calendar days. There are several things a student can do to hasten this process:

- Make sure that you have a current local address on file with the University Registrar. If you do not have a current local address on file, all materials regarding the allegations of academic misconduct will be sent to your home address. This often delays the notification and scheduling processes significantly.
- Once COAM is notified of the allegations, we will notify you by mail of the allegations. Once you receive this letter, you should telephone COAM's office immediately and schedule a pre-hearing conference. Pre-hearing conferences are scheduled on a "first-come first-served" basis, so the longer you wait the less likely you will be able to find a time that fits into your schedule.
- Once you are notified by COAM of the allegations, make sure that you notify COAM of any changes in your personal information (especially your mailing address).
- Prior to the pre-hearing conference, read the University's Code of Student Conduct and COAM's Procedures and Rules document. In particular, you should be aware that allegations of academic misconduct can be resolved via either a panel hearing or an administrative decision, and that the method you select could affect the length of time required to resolve the allegations.
- Hearings to resolve allegations of academic misconduct for students enrolled at any of the regional campuses are scheduled less frequently than for those students enrolled on the main campus and, therefore, tend to take longer to resolve. Thus, if you are enrolled
at one of the regional campuses and charged with academic misconduct, you should take special care to follow the above suggestions and, thereby, minimize the amount of time necessary to resolve the allegations. If you elect to have a panel hearing, the hearing will be scheduled to take place on the regional campus at which you are (were) enrolled. However, you can request that a hearing be held on the main campus. Since hearings on the main campus are scheduled more often, having your hearing on the main campus could shorten the process dramatically.

What happens to a student if s/he is found "in violation of the Code of Student Conduct??"

If the Committee on Academic Misconduct determines that the allegations of academic misconduct are supported by a preponderance of the evidence, the student is found "in violation of the Code of Student Conduct," and the student is sanctioned. The sanction consists of two parts, a disciplinary sanction and a grade sanction.

Disciplinary Sanctions

Any student found "in violation of the Code of Student Conduct" receives a disciplinary sanction such as a letter of reprimand, disciplinary probation, suspension, or dismissal. The Committee views the hearing as an educational process, and in most cases it has no desire to interrupt an undergraduate student's academic progress. Thus, undergraduate students found "in violation of the Code of Student Conduct" for the first time typically receive a letter of reprimand or disciplinary probation. In cases where the violations of the Code are egregious or the student has previous violations of the Code of Student Conduct, the Committee may suspend or dismiss the student.

Grade Sanctions

The Committee also authorizes a grade sanction to the course instructor. The severity of the grade sanction depends on the nature of the student's behavior and any mitigating or aggravating circumstances. The grade sanction can range from an authorization that the student receive a "0" on the assignment to an authorization that the student receive a final grade of "E" in a course.

If a student drops a course after being notified by the course instructor or the Committee on Academic Misconduct of allegations of academic misconduct, and the student is found subsequently to be "in violation" of the Code of Student Conduct and the authorized grade sanction is a failing grade (E, U, or NP) in the course, the student will be re-enrolled in the course in which the academic misconduct occurred and given a failing grade. This policy does not apply if (1) a student drops the course before he/she is notified of the allegations of academic misconduct or (2) a student drops the course after being notified of allegations of academic misconduct and the grade sanction is anything other than a failing grade in the course.

Can a student use the freshman forgiveness rule if s/he is found "in violation of the Code of Student Conduct" and receives a grade sanction?
As long as the student meets the criteria for the "freshman forgiveness rule," the student may apply the rule to a grade sanction. As stated in the "University Faculty Rules" dated June 7, 2005, the "freshman forgiveness rule" (Rule 3335-8-27.1) is as follows:

*If a course in which an undergraduate student receives a grade of "D+," "D," "E," or "EN" taken during the freshman year (the period during which the first forty-four credit hours are accumulated on the student's official permanent record) is repeated before the end of that student's sophomore year (when the student will have accumulated a total of eighty-nine credit hours), the original course credit and and grade will be automatically excluded from the calculation of the student's cumulative point-hour ratio and deficiency points, but will remain on the student's official permanent record. This action will be subject to the following conditions:*

1. *If the grade in the original course was a "D+" or "D," a student may repeat the course for credit only upon the recommendation of the authorized representative of the dean, or director of the student's enrollment unit. Such recommendation must be obtained before noon of the third Saturday of the quarter in which the repeated course is taken.*
2. *The same course may be repeated only once under this rule.*
3. *This rule may be applied for a maximum of fifteen credit hours.*

**What happens if a student is found "not in violation of the Code of Student Conduct?"**

If the Committee on Academic Misconduct determines that the allegations of academic misconduct are not supported by a preponderance of the evidence, the student is found "not in violation of the Code of Student Conduct." In such cases, COAM maintains a permanent list of the names of students found "not in violation." However, all records pertaining to such a case are destroyed one year after the case has been resolved.

**Can a student appeal the decision of COAM?**

If a student is found "in violation of the Code of Student Conduct," the student may appeal the Committee's decision. The appeal process is described in the Code of Student Conduct (3335-23-18) and the Committee's Procedures and Rules (Section 11). Students are informed of the appeal process when they meet with the Committee's Coordinator, when the Committee's decision is read at the hearing, and in the letter that they receive after the hearing. A student may appeal the Committee's decision based only upon one or more of the following grounds:

- Procedural error;
- Misapplication or misinterpretation of the rule alleged to have been violated;
- Findings of facts not supported by a preponderance of the evidence;
- Discovery of substantial new facts that were unavailable at the time of the hearing; and
- That the sanction imposed is grossly disproportionate to the violation committed.

If a student elects to have a case resolved in an administrative decision, the only basis for an appeal is that the sanction imposed is grossly disproportionate to the violation committed (see Section 5 of the Committee's Procedures and Rules).
Each student is limited to one appeal, and the decision of the appeal officer is final.

**How long does the appeal process work and what are the possible outcomes of an appeal?**

If a student is found "in violation of the Code of Student Conduct," the student is notified in writing of the panel's (hearing officer's) decision. To appeal this decision, a student must submit his/her appeal to the Executive Vice President and Provost of the University (Office of Academic Affairs) within 10 days of the date on the letter that notified him/her of the panel's (hearing officer's) decision. As noted in the previous FAQ, the student's appeal must be based on one or more specific criteria.

If a student appeals, there is not another hearing to resolve the appeal. Rather, the provost or his designated appeal officer in the Office of Academic Affairs reviews all of the information relative to the case and determines if the student's appeal has merit. This review process can take several weeks to complete. Once the officer in Academic Affairs makes his/her decision, the student is notified of the decision.

If the that officer determines that the student's appeal does not have merit, then the panel's (hearing officer's) decision and the disciplinary and grade sanctions are not changed. If the officer in Academic Affairs determines that the student's appeal does have merit, then the Academic Affairs has several options depending on the basis of the appeal and the circumstances of the hearing. These options include (but are not necessarily limited to):

- Overturning the decision (verdict);
- Sending the case back to COAM for a new hearing;
- Modifying the disciplinary sanction;
- Modifying the grade sanction.

**What happens if I'm charged with academic misconduct during the spring quarter and I'm not enrolled for winter quarter classes?**

The Committee on Academic Misconduct does hold a limited number of panel hearings during the summer quarter. If a student has a pending case (e.g., from the previous spring quarter), COAM will attempt to schedule a hearing to resolve this case during the summer quarter as long as both the student and instructor are available. If either the student or instructor is not available, the hearing will not be scheduled until the autumn quarter.

If you have a pending case and are enrolled for courses during the summer quarter, we will assume that you are available for a hearing and attempt to schedule one. If we are able to schedule your hearing, we will notify you of the hearing date and time by mail.

If you have a pending case and are not enrolled for courses during the summer quarter, but you live in central Ohio, we will contact you via your OSU e-mail account to determine if you would like to schedule a hearing for summer quarter. If you want a hearing, we will attempt to schedule
one. If you do not want a hearing (or we are unable to contact you), a hearing will be scheduled for autumn quarter.

If you have a pending case, are not enrolled in courses during the summer quarter, and do not live in central Ohio, we will assume that you are not available for a hearing during the summer quarter. However, if you are willing to return to campus for a hearing, you can request that a hearing be scheduled. Your request for a summer quarter hearing must be submitted in writing (e-mail is acceptable, but it must originate via your OSU e-mail account), and it should be submitted at least one month before you want the hearing scheduled. Because of COAM's limited hearing schedule during the summer quarter, there is no guarantee that such requests can be honored.

**How are cases of alleged academic misconduct handled for students enrolled at the regional campuses?**

With the one exception noted in the following paragraph, allegations of academic misconduct are handled the same for students enrolled at the main (Columbus) and regional (ATI, Lima, Newark, Mansfield, Marion) campuses. Thus, virtually all of the information in these web pages applies to students regardless of the campus at which they are enrolled.

The one exception is the location of the panel hearing. If a student is enrolled at a regional campus and elects to have a panel hearing to resolve allegations of academic misconduct, the hearing will be scheduled for the regional campus at which the student is (was) enrolled. However, the student does have the option of having the hearing on the Columbus campus. If the student wants his/her hearing on the Columbus campus, the student must make this request in writing to the Coordinator of COAM, and the request must be made before the hearing is scheduled on the regional campus.

**Are cases of alleged academic misconduct involving undergraduate and graduate students handled the same way?**

Under the University's and COAM's current rules and policies, cases involving undergraduate and graduate students are processed and resolved in the same way. If an undergraduate student is found "in violation" of the University's Code of Student Conduct, the student's enrollment college is not notified of the Committee's finding. If a graduate student is found "in violation," the Graduate School is notified of the nature of the violation and the sanction.

**What records does the University keep relative to allegations of academic misconduct?**

When students are found "not in violation of the Code of Student Conduct," COAM maintains a permanent list of such students' names. However, the Committee destroys all of its records that pertain to a case one year after the case is resolved.

If a student is found "in violation of the Code of Student Conduct," the Committee maintains records of the allegations and hearing according to its records retention policy. A record of the
violation is also kept in the University's Office of Judicial Affairs. These records are confidential.

If a graduate student in found "in violation," the Graduate School is notified of the nature of the violation and the sanction imposed.

**What information is entered in a student's "permanent record?"**

If a student is found "not in violation," nothing is entered in the student's permanent record.

If a student is found "in violation" and his/her grade in a course is changed as a result of the Committee's grade sanction, the new grade appears on the student's transcript. However, there is no indication on the student's transcript that he/she received a particular grade as a result of the Committee's sanction. For example, if a student fails a course as a result of the Committee's sanction, there is no indication that the failing grade was a result of academic misconduct.

If a student is found "in violation" and the disciplinary sanction is a formal reprimand or disciplinary probation, the disciplinary sanction is not entered in any of the student's permanent records (e.g., transcript, advising report, student databases). If the disciplinary sanction is suspension or dismissal, an appropriate notation ("disciplinary suspension" or "disciplinary dismissal") is added to the student's transcript.

Once the conditions of a disciplinary suspension have been fulfilled, a student may request that the "disciplinary suspension" notation be removed from his/her transcript. This request must be submitted through COAM's office. Since "dismissal" from the University is permanent, a "disciplinary dismissal" notation on a student's transcript is permanent.

**How long does the University maintain academic misconduct records?**

If the disciplinary sanction for violating the University's Code of Student Conduct is anything other than "dismissal," the University maintains a copy of a student's judicial records for 10 years. After 10 years, the student's judicial record is destroyed. If a student is "dismissed" from the University for academic misconduct, the University maintains a copy of the student's judicial record for 50 years. After 50 years, the student's judicial record is destroyed.

**After a case is resolved, what should I do with my records regarding the allegation?**

Since the University maintains all of the necessary records pertaining to allegations and findings of academic misconduct, you may destroy all of your records following resolution of a case. Although you are not required under the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) to destroy your records of alleged academic misconduct, you should recognize that the FERPA regulations do apply to any records that you retain (click [here](#) for a .pdf file of these regulations).

**Who has access to the records of COAM hearings?**
As with all students' records at The Ohio State University, the Committee's records are confidential. The student may access these records, and the student may give permission for others to view these records. University personnel have access to these records on a "need to know" basis.
## Labeling Framework for Course Sections

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In-Classroom or On-Site Activities</th>
<th>Student Use of Technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Distance (D)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO scheduled in-classroom or on-site activities</td>
<td>Significant (S) SIGNIFICANT student interactive use of technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate to Minimal (M) MODERATE to MINIMAL student interactive use of technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hybrid (Y)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME scheduled in-classroom or on-site activities</td>
<td>Significant (S) SIGNIFICANT student interactive use of technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate to Minimal (M) MODERATE to MINIMAL student interactive use of technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regular (R)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALL scheduled in-classroom or on-site activities</td>
<td>Significant (S) SIGNIFICANT student interactive use of technology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate to Minimal (M) MODERATE to MINIMAL student interactive use of technology</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q&A and Use-Cases for Instructors Using the Labeling Framework

**Question:** Should I use the framework for labeling courses or for course sections?

**Answer:** The framework is to be used for labeling course sections.

**Question:** My course requires that students “meet” together using a webinar application (for example, Adobe Connect) twice a week. Since we all need to be in the same virtual location at the same time every week, does that make my section Distance or Hybrid?

**Answer:** The distinction between Distance and Hybrid has to do with physical location. For your course, students can be located anywhere physically; they are only required to login to your webinar room at a particular time. This makes your course a Distance course.

**Question:** I have heard the terms “synchronous” and “asynchronous” applied to distance education courses. My students aren’t required to meet in a webinar room or chat session at the same time every week, which I understand would make my course synchronous. However, they do have to meet weekly deadlines for discussion participation and completing group projects. Does that make my course synchronous or asynchronous?

**Answer:** Your course meets the usual definition of an asynchronous distance course. Students have regular deadlines, which helps keep everyone on track, but they have leeway in when they do the work to meet those deadlines. If you didn’t have deadlines and interactive group work, your course would be less a course and more a tutorial.

**Question:** Because of accreditation concerns (or the need to verify student identity, or to observe required skills first-hand, etc.), my students must come to a specified Ohio State location to take midterm and final exams. Everything else in my course is conducted online. Is my course Distance or Hybrid?

**Answer:** One of the assumptions of the Ohio State framework is that if students are required to come to a specific location at a specific time for a course activity, the course is by definition Hybrid. On the other hand, if students could arrange to take their exams in a proctored situation that is acceptable to you but in a location of their own choosing, your course would be Distance.

**Question:** My Distance (or Hybrid) course requires that my students have access to a fairly specific set of hardware, software, and internet connectivity. Will this framework provide them with the information they need to be ready to start class on the first day of the term.

**Answer:** By itself, this framework will not inform students about specific technology requirements for any particular course. It will merely let you indicate that there will be heavy technology requirements. Presumably, students who enroll under those assumptions will expect to hear from you well before the quarter begins with details about what they will need. You might want to communicate to students about both the actual technology and technology-related skills they will need.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In-Classroom or On-Site Activities [1]</th>
<th>Student Interactive Use of Technology [1]</th>
<th>Strategies / Use Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distance (D)</td>
<td>Significant (S)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO scheduled in-classroom or on-site</td>
<td>SIGNIFICANT student interactive use of</td>
<td>• Instructor and students meet twice a week in a webinar space to hear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities</td>
<td>technology</td>
<td>presentions and discuss materials. The instructor is available in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>webinar space for optional office hours at regularly scheduled intervals;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>students can also ask to use the webinar space for group. Assignments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and other activities encourage interactions between students as well as</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>between students and instructor. If the course requires a secure exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>structure, students arrange a local proctoring location, using guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and suggestions provided by the instructor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The instructor provides recorded &quot;lectures&quot; to introduce concepts and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>demonstrate skills. Heavy use is made of the LMS or other medium (blogs,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>chats, discussions, wikis) to share ideas, present concepts, and promote</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>learning. Assignments and other activities encourage interactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>between students as well as between students and instructor. If the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>course requires a secure exam structure, students arrange a local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>proctoring location, using guidelines and suggestions provided by the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>instructor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate to Minimal (M)</td>
<td>MODERATE to MINIMAL student interactive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>use of technology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The instructor provides recorded &quot;lectures&quot; to introduce concepts and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>demonstrate skills. Other materials are shared, &quot;open-book&quot; quizzes are</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>conducted, and individual assignments turned in via the LMS. The selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and pacing of assignments with deadlines keeps everyone progressing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>through the course, though they do not promote interaction and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>communication between students. If the course requires a secure exam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>structure, students arrange a local proctoring location, using guidelines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>and suggestions provided by the instructor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Self-paced tutorial – instructor provides video and written materials</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>in the LMS. Instructor also provides written and/or quiz-based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hybrid (Y)</td>
<td>Significant (S)</td>
<td>assignments, to be conducted or turned via the LMS. Student completes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME scheduled in-classroom or on-site</td>
<td>SIGNIFICANT student interactive use of</td>
<td>assignments as desired; instructor provides feedback via LMS upon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>activities</td>
<td>technology</td>
<td>completion of assignments (either individually generated or auto-generated).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>If the course requires a secure exam structure, students arrange a local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>proctoring location, using guidelines and suggestions provided in the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>course.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and instructor.

- Instructor and students meet every other week in a face-to-face classroom to hear presentations and discuss materials. During in-class meetings, a classroom response system is used to facilitate interaction and discussion. If the course requires a secure exam structure, exams will be held during face-to-face classroom time. Heavy use is made of the LMS or other mediums (blogs, chats, discussions, wikis) to share ideas, present concepts, and promote learning. Assignments and other activities encourage interactions between students as well as between students and instructor.

- Instructor and students meet every other week in a face-to-face classroom to hear presentations and discuss materials. On alternate weeks, the class meets in a webinar space. The webinar space is also available for office hours and group work. If the course requires a secure exam structure, exams will be held during face-to-face classroom time. Heavy use is made of the LMS or other mediums (blogs, chats, discussions, wikis) to share ideas, present concepts, and promote learning. Assignments and other activities encourage interactions between students as well as between students and instructor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regular (R)</th>
<th>ALL scheduled in-classroom or on-site activities</th>
<th>Significant (S)</th>
<th>MODERATE to MINIMAL student interactive use of technology</th>
<th>MODERATE to MINIMAL student interactive use of technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Moderate to Minimal (M)</td>
<td>Internships or courses that require significant out-of-class research work – Instructor and students meet every other week in a face-to-face classroom to hear presentations and discuss materials. Students meet individually with the instructor on a scheduled pattern, at a mutually agreeable time (or during regularly available windows of time) to discuss their work. Assignments do not promote interaction and communication between students. If the course requires a secure exam structure, exams will be held during face-to-face classroom time.</td>
<td>Instructors and students meet two or three times a week in a classroom equipped with SMART boards for presentation and discussion of materials. All students bring with them “clickers” for the classroom response system used during lecture to promote structured discussion. Heavy use is made of the LMS or other mediums (blogs, chats, discussions, wikis) to share ideas, present concepts, and promote learning. In-class and out of class assignments and other activities encourage interactions between students as well as between students and instructor. Secure exams are taken in class, though out-of-class exams are possible.</td>
<td>Instructors and students meeting two or three times a week in a regular (though wireless-ready) classroom. During discussion or in-class assignments, students use their mobile devices (laptops, smartphones, etc.) to research answers to questions posed by the instructor or to collaboratively complete assignments in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
online spaces. Heavy use is made of the LMS or other mediums (blogs, chats, discussions, wikis) to share ideas, present concepts, and promote learning. In-class and out-of-class assignments and other activities encourage interactions between students as well as between students and instructor. Secure exams are taken in class, though out-of-class exams are possible.

- Instructors and students meet two or three times a week in a lab for hands-on learning experience. During discussion or in-class assignments, students use their mobile devices (laptops, smartphones, etc.) to research answers to questions posed by the instructor or to collaboratively complete assignments in online spaces. Heavy use is made of the LMS or other mediums (blogs, chats, discussions, wikis) to share ideas, present concepts, and promote learning. In-class and out-of-class assignments and other activities encourage interactions between students as well as between students and instructor. Secure exams are taken in class, though out-of-class exams are possible.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Moderate to Minimal (M)</th>
<th>MODERATE to MINIMAL student interactive use of technology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

- Instructor and students meet two or three times a week in a classroom for presentation and discussion of materials. In-class and out-of-class assignments and other activities probably do not encourage interaction with the instructor except for regularly scheduled in-person office hours. Secure exams are taken in class, though out-of-class exams are possible.

- Instructors and students meet two or three times a week in a lab for hands-on learning experience. In-class and out-of-class assignments and other activities probably do not encourage interaction with the instructor except for regularly scheduled in-person office hours. Secure exams are taken in class, though out-of-class exams are possible.

[1] A course code is defined by two letters: the first (D, Y or R) describes the in-classroom or on-site activities; the second (S or M) describes the level of interactive learning technology used in the class. Two examples: A "DM" class has no in-class activities (including exams) (D) and students will use relatively little interactive learning technology because it is delivered primarily through one-way communications (M). A "RS" class has all in-classroom or lab activities (R) and uses a significant amount of blogs, chat or other forms of interactive learning technology (S) in the process of learning.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Autumn Semester</th>
<th>Winter Semester</th>
<th>Spring Semester</th>
<th>Summer Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td>Session 1</td>
<td>Session 2</td>
<td>May Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May Session</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 8</td>
<td>Second Session</td>
<td>Second Session</td>
<td>Classes begin the day after Spring Commencement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 9</td>
<td>begins on Friday</td>
<td>begins on</td>
<td>This break is generally 1, but sometimes 2, weeks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 10</td>
<td>of the 8th week.</td>
<td>Wednesday of the 8th week.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 11</td>
<td>Note: No classes</td>
<td>Spring Semester</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 12</td>
<td>the Wednesday</td>
<td>includes one full break week during the term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 13</td>
<td>before Thanksgiving.</td>
<td>(after Week 9).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams</td>
<td>Commencement no</td>
<td>Commencement no</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break</td>
<td>later than December 21.</td>
<td>later than</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
<td>December 21.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams/Commencement (Sunday)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams/Commencement (Sunday)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Second Session begins on Friday of the 8th week.

Since Autumn Semester begins on a Wednesday, and there are several holidays during the semester, the span of the semester actually covers 16 calendar weeks.
Dual Enrollment Trends
March 2012

10 years ago, 3% of Ohio State’s incoming class entered with 1 year or more of college credit. In Autumn 2011, 10% entered with 1 year or more of college credit. This credit comes from AP, IB, CLEP, CTAG, Engineering Project Lead the Way, and dual enrollment.

Ohio State Dual Enrollment Activities
OSU Academy
- Long-standing Post-Secondary Option dual enrollment program for individual highly qualified students.
- 2010-2011 Columbus: 285 seniors
- 201 admission applications for 2011-2012.
- 103 attending Autumn 2011.

Seniors to Sophomores
- 3-5 Columbus City Schools seniors/year as full-time students on Columbus campus.

Metro Early College STEM High School
- 37 of 73 students from Metro’s first graduating class (2010) applied to and accepted at Ohio State Columbus Campus.
  - Entered with total 1497 hours of college credit
  - Completed first traditional years of college with an average 2.83 GPA (4 above 3.75 and 4 below 2.0).
- 55 of 93 students from Metro’s Class of 2011 accepted to Ohio State Columbus.
  - 45 entered.
    - Entered with total ~2050 hours of college credit. (5-128)
- Ongoing partnerships with Math 151/152 and English 110 and 269.

“Niche” Programs
- 2009, CAA-approved policy for programs that take advantage of particular need of school district and particular strength of Ohio State.
- ~11 programs/year, many admit students through the OSU Academy (foreign languages, Stone Lab science, Engineering, Fisher, EHE).

Identification of Needs
- Toolkit based on input from advisors about challenges faced by students who enter with large amounts of college credit.
- Special orientation session for families of students entering with large amounts of college credit.
- Freshman Forgiveness applicability.
- Honors status challenges.
- Columbus City Schools Higher Education Partnership course alignment in math and English

Data Collection and Analysis (with Registrar and Office of Institutional Research and Planning)
- Success and retention rates of students who enter Ohio State with Math 151 dual enrollment credit.
- Numbers of students who enter Ohio State with Ohio Transfer Module Credit (GE).

(over)
Ohio Indicators for the Future

- OBOR development of dual enrollment guidelines (curricular, student, instructor, fiscal).

- College Board College Completion panel at the Statehouse January 27
  David Harrison of Columbus State, Chancellor Jim Petro, and State Representative Randy
  Gardner, Superintendent Gene Harris, all stated their support for offering more high school
  students opportunities to earn college credit in high school.
  http://www.dispatch.com/content/blogs/the-eteam/2012/01/college-completion.html

- Regional Summit on College Access and Attainment goals for collaboration among central
  K-12 districts and higher education institutions focus on math and English and expansion of dual
  enrollment credit.

- Columbus State’s ramping up of dual enrollment offerings. CSCC expects to teach 400 dual
  enrollment classes per year (~8000 students) starting with its own faculty and eventually moving
  to high school teachers with at least an MA in the content field. Ex: Columbus State is
  establishing a satellite campus at a Reynoldsburg high school for RCS students and adults in the
  community http://www.dispatch.com/content/stories/local/2012/02/22/columbus-state-
  partnering-with-reynoldsburg-schools.html

- Central Ohio K-12 districts college readiness tests. CSCC reports districts’ goals to give
  “college readiness” tests at the end of sophomore and junior years. Students ready for college
  may begin dual enrollment courses. Districts will work with students not “college ready” to
  improve their performances. These college readiness tests will include PARCC (OGT
  replacement) and other nationally standardized tests.

- Central Ohio K-12 district superintendents increasing emphasis on value of dual enrollment
  credit. Ex: Wade Lucas of Olentangy Schools’ goal is that all Olentangy students graduate with a
  year of college credit “in their pockets.” Columbus City Schools Higher Education Partnership
  (HEP) is creating inventory of “college experiences” open to students, with a goal of reaching
  more students.