
College of Science Academic Misconduct Reporting Process

The College of Science (COS) adheres to the Oregon State University (OSU) standards and requirements for academic misconduct reporting. When the faculty of record for a course has evidence to suggest academic misconduct has occurred and has deemed an academic penalty is warranted, the case for academic misconduct must be submitted through the official OSU [conduct system](#). It is OSU policy that faculty are allowed to give a warning to a student without filing a report as long as there is no academic penalty that goes with the warning. Faculty are not allowed to assign an academic penalty for academic misconduct without going through the official OSU [conduct process](#). The College Hearing Officer (CHO) handles academic misconduct cases, determines responsibility, and if appropriate determines any sanctions for the academic misconduct for all cases that occur in COS courses.

ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT REPORTING PROCEDURES

See [here](#) for details on the academic integrity process at OSU. If a faculty member suspects academic misconduct, they are at liberty to discuss with the student, issue a warning for the behavior (and provide the guidance to help the student understand how to avoid the behavior in the future), and/or provide an opportunity to resubmit work for the same point value (no loss of points in the class). If a student disagrees with the allegation of academic misconduct, or if the faculty member determines an academic penalty in the course is warranted, the [case must be submitted](#) through the formal conduct process per OSU policy. Faculty cannot implement academic penalties in their course for suspected academic misconduct.

In the case where it is deemed appropriate for an academic penalty for the suspected academic misconduct, the following steps should be followed:

1. Faculty consults with the Department Head or department designee before filing a case.
2. Faculty submit a formal [academic misconduct report](#). The report should include a clear explanation of the incident, syllabi and assignment/exam statements of academic integrity course policies, a suggested academic penalty, and all evidence that documents academic misconduct for the case. Teaching Assistants should not submit academic misconduct cases in courses, only the faculty of record for the course or the faculty supervisor can submit the academic misconduct case.
3. The submitted report goes to the CHO, who will have a meeting with the student and determine if responsibility is found, and if appropriate the academic sanctions and penalties for the academic misconduct. The CHO determines responsibility and potential academic sanctions in line with OSU policy and standards and based on the individual circumstances of the specific case.
4. After a judgment in the case has been determined, students have the option to appeal to the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs. Faculty are not able to appeal a decision made by the CHO.
5. Upon notification of the outcome of the academic misconduct case, faculty adjust points and grades in the course per any academic penalties that are determined by the CHO. If no penalties are issued, the faculty cannot alter the grade of the student in the course for

the suspected academic misconduct behavior.

Student records, including academic misconduct allegations and reports, are private and protected by FERPA. No one outside of a need-to-know basis, which includes the faculty member, Department Head (or department designee), CHO, and the student, should know about the allegation of academic misconduct.

DEFINE ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT IN THE COURSE SYLLABUS

Academic misconduct can occur in several forms, defined [here](#). Course syllabi and assignment/exam instructions should be precise and clear on course policies related to academic integrity and what constitutes academic dishonesty in the context of the course. Cases of academic misconduct that are submitted will require syllabi and/or assignment/exam statements related to academic misconduct to show evidence that a violation has occurred. See the [Dean of Students website](#) for sample syllabus language related to academic honesty and academic misconduct. It is recommended to also remind students specifically about academic integrity expectations before each assignment and exam.

EXAMPLES OF ISSUES RELATED TO ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

Below are some examples of items to consider in your syllabi statements, assignment and/or exam instructions, and for general discussion in the context of your course.

- Students are often allowed to, or encouraged to, work in collaborative groups for course work. Expectations of handing in unique solutions and work is needed in the context of allowing group studying and homework completion.
- Course policies on the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools for coursework differ from course to course. Clearly define what is allowed and expected in your course related to AI use. For academic misconduct cases involving AI, common AI detectors are not sufficient evidence of academic misconduct, additional evidence will need to be provided for the case submission. See the [COS guidelines pertaining to AI use](#) in the classroom.
- If students are instructed to put away phones during an exam, be clear what exactly this means. Are phones allowed in pockets? Are smart watches allowed to be worn? Be specific about exactly what is expected.
- Some students use online tutors from sites such as Chegg.com. If you do not allow the use of sites like this, specify this clearly in the syllabus and discuss in class.
- Consider specifying if students are not permitted to share or publish course materials, including on internet sites such as CourseHero, Chegg.com, Quizlet, etc. You can inform students that you look for materials from your course on these sites and will report instances of violations of the course policy and the [Code of Student Conduct](#).

POLICY HISTORY

Revision Date	Description
10.12.2018	Initial version by Henri Jansen
08.20.2019	Initial posting to CoS Policy and Processes website
01.06.2020	Revision by Henri Jansen.
09.01.2023	Revision by Associate Dean of Academic and Student Affairs, Jessica Siegel.