

**MINUTES**  
**Kansas State University Faculty Senate Meeting**  
**September 9, 2003 3:30 p.m. Big 12 Room, K-State Union**

Present: Ackerman, Adams, Anderson, Arck, Baker, Behnke, Bloomquist, Brigham, Brockway, Cauble, Chang, G. Clark, R. Clark, Clegg, Cochran, Cox, De Bres, DeLuccie, Dodd, Eckels, Elder, Erickson, Fairchild, Fick, Fritz, Gehrt, Gormely, Grauer, Greene, Grunewald, Gwinner, Haddock, Hamilton, Hancock, Hedrick, Hosni, Johnston, Jones, Jurich, Kirkham, Knapp, Maatta, Mack, McCulloh, McHaney, Meier, Michie, Morrow, Nafziger, Oberst, Olsen, Pacey, Prince, Rahman, Ransom, Reese, Rintoul, Roozeboom, T. Ross, Rys, Schmidt, Schumm, Simon, F. Smith, Spears, Spikes, Spooner, Stadlander, Stewart, Stockham, Trussell, Warner, Watts, Wilkie, Willbrant, Zabel

Proxies: Dandu, Maes, Marr, Rietcheck

Absent: Dhuyvetter, Dryden, Dubois, Grice, Jackson, O'Hara, Quaife, Rolley, Schlup, C. Ross, Schlup, M. Smith, Staggenborg, Thompson

Parliamentarian: Jerry Frieman

Visitors: Steve Morris, Barbara Morris, Ken Holland

- I. President Bob Zabel called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.
- II. It was moved to approve the minutes of the August 19, 2003 meeting. Motion was seconded and passed.
- III. Announcements
  - A. Faculty Senate Leadership Council  
President Zabel announced that the council has not met with President's Staff since the last Faculty Senate meeting. The Council is determining the membership of the Compensation Task Force to be wide representation but still a manageable size.
  - B. Report from Student Senate  
Student Senate Representative Sam Meier reported that Student Senate is reviewing the Safe Ride program that is quite popular with the students. They will be meeting with administration to discuss the tuition enhancement programs that were implemented this year and will be discussing future enhancements.
  - C. Calendar Issues (10 minutes of discussion with comments limited to calendar policies and procedures) **ATTACHMENT 1**  
Past President Al Cochran discussed the University Calendar Committee Policies and Procedures Draft Document. The final document will come before Faculty Senate for a vote next month. After this draft was distributed, John O'Hara, who was unable to attend

the meeting today, had mentioned to Al that he will have input into the policy at the next meeting. Senator Rahman requested clarification on this committee. Al explained that it is a standing committee of Faculty Senate with a recommendation made every five years. However, the committee may address special requests as they arise in the interim.

D. Other

President Zabel announced that his State of the University address will be attached to the minutes of this meeting. **ATTACHMENT 2**

- IV. Legislative issues - Steve Morris, Senator from the 39th district of Kansas  
President Zabel introduced Senator Morris, a graduate of K-State in Agriculture Economics. Senator Morris is the chair of Senate Ways and Means Committee and past chair of the Building Committee, currently serving as vice-chair of that committee. He is also the past president of K-State Alumni Association and a strong supporter of K-State.

Senator Morris provided his perceptions on the upcoming legislative session. It appears that the 2005 budget year will be an austere budget year and should be similar to the 2004 budget year. The mood is cautiously optimistic because personal income tax receipts were up in August. There are several statutory items in the state budget that must be addressed such as:

- 7.5 % ending balance requirement
- \$180 million highway transfer
- \$100 million to cities and counties

In addition, the KPERS unfunded liability increased from \$1 billion to \$2.2 billion with the downturn in the market. They are currently increasing contribution rates .2% per year but this increase will be doubling - needs to get to 15% by 2017 unless earnings increase substantially.

The revised sales tax measure is projected to be an onerous burden to many businesses. The governor placed a moratorium on this until January which will likely be extended until July 2004. Impetus behind the bill was to have a plan in place to tax internet sales once Congress removes the moratorium on assessing this tax. The legislature may implement a threshold such that any business doing less than \$5 million annual business would be exempt from this sales tax measure. Property tax will be due May 20 instead of June 20 which will be a one-time change in order to increase 2004 revenue.

He is looking at a Crumbling Classroom II program to improve Regents infrastructure. Senator Morris is proposing a bond issuance to pay for these improvements. Senator Hamilton asked about the bond rating of the state. Senator Morris did not know what the current rating is but thought it was one rating below the top rating. Senator Anderson commented that other states are looking at significant increases in income taxes to fund education. Senator Morris replied if revenues stay stable and the state does not fund everything, we would not need a tax increase. The likelihood of a tax increase is not very high. Democrats are not interested in a tax increase, Senate moderate republicans may vote for a needed tax increase but conservative republicans would not support an increase. If needed there is more likelihood of passing a sales tax increase than a personal income tax increase.

As of August we are \$16 million above revenue projections. The next revenue estimate will be done in November 2003.

There will not be a direct effect of the KPERS unfunded liability on higher education, but extra dollars will be needed to begin to balance the KPERS liability. The SB 345 legislation passed a few years ago to restructure higher education has not been funded now for two years. The actual funding needed is much more than originally passed in the funding formula. The Kansas Board of Regents is looking at alternative funding solutions. It is a high priority in FY 2005 to put \$15 million into this program but not fully fund the original formula.

- V. Honor System Annual Report - Phil Anderson **ATTACHMENT 3**  
Phil Anderson, Director of the Honor System, discussed the annual Honor System report.

The Honor Council is aware that some faculty members choose not to file honor system reports. The Honor Council is bound by confidentiality. By filing the report faculty are helping the student in the long run. The Honor System is university policy, and it becomes difficult for the University Attorney to defend faculty when they do not follow the policy.

Senator Hosni asked about Graduate students following the same policy. Senator Anderson reported that the Graduate Council is reviewing that possibility for possible adoption later this year.

In response to a question, Senator Anderson said that a faculty member cannot give an XF without filing a report of honor system violation.

- VI. Report from Standing Committees

- A. Academic Affairs Committee - Jackie Spears

President-Elect Jackie Spears reported that no chair has been identified. Each member of Academic Affairs was to ask their caucus for a volunteer to chair the committee. She does have a volunteer to serve as co-chair the committee. The meeting next week will be the last one that she will chair.

- B. Faculty Affairs Committee - Roger Adams

Senator Roger Adams announced that the committee is continuing to work with the Faculty Salaries and Fringe Benefits subcommittee awards proposal that may be ready to bring to the Senate floor at the October meeting.

Senator Jurich asked about the status of the Tuition Waiver proposal. President Zabel stated that Ft. Hays State University tuition proposal was tabled to allow Board of Regents staff to further study it. There is a concern about offering the waiver to Regents classified employees and not to all state classified employees. K-State's proposal will be included in the Compensation Task Force. K-State administration is supportive of the program. Senator Michie expressed support for a system-wide program to allow dependents to attend any Regents institution.

- C. Faculty Senate Committee on University Planning - Walter Schumm

Senator Schumm reported that they had the first meeting to discuss the effects of budget cuts on this year and the impact of any consequences of program assessment.

D. Faculty Senate Committee on Technology - Mike Haddock

Senator Haddock reported that Harvard Townsend, Director of Computing and Network Services attended their first meeting and discussed security issues of the worm attacks in late August. This was the largest single attack on the university computing systems. The security incidence response team played a significant and successful role in addressing the problem. Consideration is being given to providing centralized updating of virus software rather than management of updates at the desktop level. Central e-mail system users will be able to filter spam in the future. There is a new e-mail enhancement project being looked at this time. Senator Michie suggested that FSCOT pursue random assigning of student IDs to help avoid identify theft.

VII. Old Business - none

VIII. New Business - none

IX For the Good of the University

Senator Michie introduced Ken Holland, the new Associate Provost for International Programs.

Senator Hamilton stated that, since returning to Senate, he has sensed a demoralized and passive-aggressive mood. He said the leadership needs to get a firmer sense of what it is appropriate to bring Senate and should tolerate and encourage vibrant and contentious debates. This is inefficient, but democracy is inefficient. He wants his time on Senate to be productive.

Senator Jurich expressed his concern that the UN flag is only in the Little Theater and not more prominently displayed.

X. The meeting was adjourned at 4:42 p.m.

## ATTACHMENT 1

University Calendar Committee  
Policies and Procedures  
Draft Document -- September 1, 2003

1. Ultimate approval authority for the academic calendar rests with the Provost.
2. The University Calendar Committee shall consist of: the University Registrar (non-voting) as chairperson, three representatives of Faculty Senate appointed by the Faculty Senate President, and two students appointed by the President of Student Governing Association.
3. In its deliberations, it is important that the University Calendar Committee maintain a good level of communication with the university community to insure sufficient input into the consideration process.
4. The University Calendar Committee shall make recommendations to the Faculty Senate Executive Committee not later than February 15. Such recommendations are then to be considered for approval by Faculty Senate.
5. The President of Faculty Senate shall forward the recommendations of the Faculty Senate to the Provost with a copy to the President of the Student Governing Association and the University Registrar not later than May 15.
6. When approved by the Provost, the calendar will be circulated via a transmittal form for signatures by the Faculty Senate President and the University Registrar.
7. The Provost will then send the calendar to the Board of Regents for approval. It will then be distributed to the university community in a timely fashion by the University Registrar.
8. The process outlined above is applicable forthwith and will be applied for calendar years 2005-2006 and thereafter. The current set of calendars, approved and on file with the Kansas Board of Regents, was revised in June 2002 and extends through academic year 2006-2007. While the Board of Regents is open to modifications to the proposed calendars at any time, standard practice is for each Regents' institution to submit a single five-year projection once every five years.

## ATTACHMENT 2

**2003 State of the University Remarks – September 5, 2003**  
**Robert Zabel, President**  
**Kansas State University Faculty and Unclassified Senate and**  
**Professor of Special Education**

Welcome to the annual State of University event hosted by Kansas State University Faculty Senate. Faculty Senate is composed of nearly 100 senators who are elected to represent approximately 1500 faculty and unclassified professionals from across the University.

Traditionally, the State of the University event has provided an opportunity for the President and Provost to offer an overview of the current status of K-State - where we have recently been as a university, as well as some of the goals, initiatives, and prospects for the immediate academic year and further into the future.

This year we're fortunate to have President Wefald and Provost Coffman as well as Vice President Tom Rawson, Vice President Bob Krause, and Vice Provost Beth Unger joining us to share their perspectives from the vantage point of their positions.

In the recent past this event has been held in Hemisphere Room of Hale Library and in Beach Museum. This year we are meeting in yet another new jewel of a space on campus that opened just one year ago. I want to thank the Alumni Center staff for sharing this beautiful space with us today.

The State of the University is one of many ways the Administration and Faculty Senate work together to keep our campus community informed and involved. It represents tangible evidence of the shared governance, which is a hallmark of the Kansas State University.

As you all know, we've experienced two especially challenging years where the university has dealt with major cuts and reductions of state funding - approximately \$7 million last year alone. While state universities across the country are experiencing similar reductions, our state budget reductions were to an already bare bones operation. And they have had ramifications across the university.

No one would argue that the cuts were painless or that they somehow improved what we do, but without the active, on-going communication and collaboration by the university community, the consequences could have been much worse. Provost Coffman and Vice Presidents Rawson and Krause spent countless hours consulting with every constituent group, explaining the size, nature, and potential impact of the reductions. They, the deans, and department heads across campus worked with faculty and unclassified professionals to find ways to handle the cuts in ways that would do the least damage to our students and programs.

For the past 16 years President Wefald and his administrative team have emphasized team-work and have actively collaborated with faculty and unclassified professionals to provide the best possible educational experiences for our students, to support research and creative endeavor of our faculty, to make our alumni and supporters proud, and to serve the citizens of Kansas and the larger world.

Over these years, there has been a remarkable renaissance at K-State. There have been tremendous increases in student enrollments and in externally funded research, and K-State is recognized as a leader in major scholarships won by our undergraduates.

Our campus looks great, and is beautifully maintained by employees of the Division of Facilities. Our campus is home to many new and remodeled buildings for classes, laboratories, performances, and meetings. These facilities are as diverse as Hale Library, the Center for Basic Cancer Research, Fielder addition to Durland, Beach Museum, Hoeflin Child Development Center, the Insect Zoo, Butterfly Museum, and University Gardens, to name just a few. Several others, such as the new Food Safety facility, are under construction.

In planning my remarks for today, I struggled with offering a cheery or dreary assessment - whether the glass is half full or half empty. Ultimately, I decided a bit of both are in order. Certainly, there are many accomplishments we should be proud about; but there is also a lot that needs to be done to move to the next level.

President Wefald has a vision of Kansas State University becoming one of the top 10 land grant institutions in the country, a goal I believe that faculty, alumni, and students - the whole university community - will heartily support.

To achieve this goal will not be easy; many things will need to happen. For example, the program of Targeted Excellence, which Provost Coffman will discuss, is being implemented to provide fiscal support for promising, cutting edge research. Targeted Excellence promises to create opportunities that will move some programs to a higher level of performance and recognition.

Whatever else might be undertaken to reach the goal of becoming a top 10 land grant university, I believe that K-State will truly become a top university when it attracts, retains, and adequately rewards a top faculty.

Despite what you and I know and believe about what we do here, too few people beyond our campus and beyond the borders of Kansas recognize the quality of this university. This is reflected in our standings on most ratings of universities.

This year's US News and World Report rankings place K-State in the third quartile among doctoral degree granting institutions, which means we rank somewhere below the top 123 universities. All but two other Big 12 universities are in the top two quartiles, and nowhere in the published report is K-State mentioned.

There are several reasons for this ranking: some of the rating criteria may be invalid measures of our university's quality, the weightings given to those criteria may further disadvantage K-State. For example, K-State has a relatively open admissions policy that allows nearly any graduate of a Kansas high school to enter the university. This admissions policy offers access and opportunities for students that are unavailable at state universities in many other states, but it also adversely affects ratings of selectivity and the graduation.

Regardless of the fairness of these rankings, the fact is, this is how K-State is widely viewed. And, unfortunately, this perception has far reaching implications on the numbers and kinds of students who consider K-State, on our ability to attract external support, on the leadership opportunities in our disciplines, and on opportunities for our graduates.

We could respond, "Who cares what US News and World Report and other major college rating systems think?" But to use a sports analogy: We might believe that we have a top athletics team, but unless the AP, Coaches, ESPN or other major polls concur, it's unlikely we'll play in any bowl games.

One criterion that is most damaging to K-State's image (and quality) is our faculty resources - salaries, fringe benefits, and other operating expenses, which account for 20% of the US News and Report rating. I could recite a litany of salary statistics - from the Big 12 conference, the six Regents selected peer institutions, the 48 land grant and state universities, the 27 land grants institutions with configurations and missions most like our own. Regardless of the comparison group, the results are the same: K-State faculty compensations is in the cellar.

Salaries of our full professors - those who have achieved and sustained high levels of performance and productivity - are especially deficient. According to The Chronicle of Higher Education (April 18, 2003) K-State professors earn about \$5000 less per year than the average salary of the bottom 1/5 of professors at doctoral degree granting institutions.

Among the 27 land grant institutions with configurations and missions most like our own - schools such as Colorado State, Iowa State, Virginia Polytechnic, Oregon State, and Purdue - the average salaries at the top 10 institutions are higher at every rank. Our professors earn about 25% less than the average of the top 10 and nearly 20% less than the average of the second 10. Remember, there are only 27 in this group, which are most like K-State in mission and configuration.

I believe the best measure of a university's quality is the quality of its faculty. K-State is fortunate to have many outstanding faculty - people who would be successful teachers, researchers, artists, and leaders anywhere. (One of the distinct benefits of my role in Faculty Senate is a greater awareness of how dedicated, talented, and productive our faculty is, and how committed it is to providing educational opportunities for our students and serving the best interests of the university.) Many of these outstanding faculty have come and stayed at K-State because of family ties, because of the quality of life they've found once they're here, and because of the collaborative, supportive university environment.

Still, we have persistent problems attracting, retaining, and rewarding productive faculty. It's no surprise that K-State has a smaller proportion of full professors than most other land grant universities.

Twelve to 15 years ago, the then Big 8 Athletic Conference considered expelling K-State for what might be called "chronic low achievement," particularly in football. It was a critical time and the implications for K-State's future were tremendous. Our university leadership and supporters realized something had to be done. With the leadership of a "can do" Administration, K-State mobilized to provide the resources that enabled the football program not only to survive, but to thrive. And, as they say, "the rest is history."

Today, we have a football program any university would be proud of. My vision is for a university that our football program could be proud of.

Faculty salaries and benefits have long been a concern of Faculty Senate and of our Administration, and I'm pleased that we will be working together to establish a Task Force on Faculty and Unclassified Compensation. This Task Force will bring together some of our best minds to develop a strategic plan, with short- and long-term solutions for this chronic problem.

The Compensation Task Force will be charged with implementing the employee tuition waiver plan developed by the Senate's Salary and Fringe Benefits Committee and passed by Faculty Senate last spring, as well as an awards and recognitions program for exemplary service to the university, which has been developed by the same committee.

Most important, the Task Force will determine ways and the means for bringing faculty and unclassified salaries in line with those of comparable universities.

So, is this a dreary or cheery message? I hope it's essentially optimistic. I believe the our glass is half full. Like many of you in this room, I have devoted most of my professional career to Kansas State University. I believe that this university is close to greatness. So many of the essential important elements of a top university are in place. With a few essential strategic improvements I believe we can make major strides in the actual and perceived quality of the university. I believe it's time for us to stop wringing our hands and to address a condition that impinges on our ability to achieve the recognition K-State deserves. When this happens, everyone in the K-State family - current and future students, alumni, faculty and unclassified professionals, Kansans - all of us who care about this university and fulfilling its mission – will benefit.

On behalf of Faculty Senate, thank you for coming. We look forward to working with all of you on behalf of K-State.



## ATTACHMENT 3

### KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY UNDERGRADUATE HONOR SYSTEM Annual Review

**Article VI of our By Laws requires the Honor System Director to provide an annual report to Student Senate, Faculty Senate and the Provost at the beginning of the subsequent fall semester. This report summarizes the activities of the Honor System for the academic year 2002-2003.**

During the 2002-2003 academic year there were 79 reports of alleged Honor Pledge violations involving 104 KSU undergraduate students. [A case-by-case summary of each case using non-identifying information is available at our web site <ksu.edu/honor>; click on “Honor Council” and then on “Annual Reports.”] As a comparison, last year there were 63 total cases reported.

Of the 104 students alleged to have violated the Honor Pledge, 63 were male while 39 were female, a ratio supported by recent national research. (One student was not identified by gender.) Nearly half of the 104 students alleged to have violated the Honor Pledge plagiarized material usually acquired on the Internet. In some cases, students plagiarized the work of roommates or friends who were careless regarding the security of personal papers and computer files. One hapless freshman, asked to write a five-page paper, plagiarized all of a nine-page paper from a dated greek file, causing a GTA to become immediately suspicious, especially when a fellow GTA discovered the nearly identical paper (edited to the required 5 pages) in another class by another freshman. Both were caught and given XFs for the course.

The 103 students had majors in the following colleges:

Architecture, Planning & Design (1)  
Agriculture (13)  
Arts & Sciences (30)  
Business Administration (16)  
Education (5)  
Engineering (13)  
Human Ecology (8)  
Technology & Aviation (10)  
Open (7)

Faculty and students who discovered and reported Honor Pledge violations did so in the following ratios:

Professors (7)  
Associate Professors (19)  
Assistant Professors (18)  
Instructors (18)  
GTAs (16)  
Student (1)

The one student who reported, observed an Honor Pledge violation in a large lecture class. Following an Honor Council investigation, the Case Investigators concluded there was insufficient information to proceed to a hearing, in part because the teaching Professor had inadvertently destroyed all test copies which were needed to support the allegations. Both the Director and Associate Director lauded the student's courage in initiating the report and urged the student to consider applying to the Student Body President for appointment to the Honor Council. The student did so, was appointed, approved by Student Senate and is now an active member of the Honor Council.

A second student also initiated reporting an Honor Pledge violation but did so anonymously to the Honor System Director by email, revealing sufficient specific information for the course's Assistant Professor to discover which student had violated the Honor Pledge. The adjudication process resulted in the student receiving an XF in the course. Unfortunately the student violator deduced the source of the initial email tip and sent the reporting student an alarming, vicious and threatening email. Upon being informed of the assault, the Dean of that college immediately suspended the student violator who was also charged with assault in criminal court. A campus security officer was assigned to escort the reporting student to and from classes for a period of time until the student felt sufficiently safe and secure. Fortunately, when faced with this kind of scenario, KSU administrators were immediately responsive to a potentially dangerous situation, using existing policies to satisfactorily resolve a difficult situation.

Of the 79 cases, 15 were reported in large (100 or more) size classes, 28 were reported in medium (25-99) size classes, and 34 were reported in small (1-24) size classes. The 104 students alleged to have violated the Honor Pledge were represented as follows:

Frosh (30)  
Sophomores (21)  
Juniors (20)  
Seniors (32)  
Unknown (1)

The unknown student was alleged to have arrived for an exam in the first section of a large class and filled out the scantron with a false ID number and name. When the Assistant Professor, after grading the exams, was left with an unaccounted exam, the suspicion was that a student who was enrolled in the second section of the class had benefitted from an early look at the exam. The Assistant Professor asked the Honor System Director and Associate Director to review the scantron and a sample of a suspected student's handwriting but our conclusion was that there was insufficient information to begin the adjudication process. The Assistant Professor has since modified the course's testing procedures to curtail the likelihood of a similar scenario occurring in the future.

Freshmen may have a larger number of violations due to their unfamiliarity with the KSU Honor System and the notion of what constitutes academic dishonesty. The Dean of Student Life, at the suggestion of the President of Honesty and Integrity Peer Educators (HIPE) and with the concurrence of the Provost, has agreed to send all new KSU students a letter informing them of the KSU Honor System and its importance to the academic community. Perhaps that information will help reduce the number of Honor Pledge violations by freshmen. The high number of senior Honor Pledge violations may be attributed to the pressure of trying to complete a degree. One senior received a second Honor Pledge violation resulting in a second XF in the same class as the

first Honor Pledge violation; apparently the student figured the only way to pass the course needed to complete the major was to cheat.

Of the 79 Cases involving 104 students, two students were found by Honor Council Hearing Panels to be not responsible for Honor Pledge violations. Six cases which occurred late in spring 2003 semester, will be resolved at the beginning of fall 2003 semester. Of the 104 students alleged to have violated the Honor Pledge, 45 received an XF for the course. Other sanctions ranged from a zero on the assignment to suspension from the university. In most cases, Hearing Panels tended to require Honor Pledge violators to enroll in and pass the Academic Integrity course within a specific period of time whether they received an XF or not. One student who was charged with an Honor Pledge violation refused to respond to the Director's requests to comply with the adjudication process. When so informed of the student's refusal, an Honor Council Hearing Panel recommended the student be suspended from the university by the Provost, who complied with the request. That student may apply for re-enrollment in January 2004.

The number of students taking the Academic Integrity course continues to escalate each year. During the academic year 2002-2003 approximately 100 students took the course. Many of their course evaluations commented that it was academically rigorous, personally challenging and, for some, life-altering. Helene Marcoux, Associate Director of the Honor System and the instructor for the Academic Integrity course, is this year taking steps to insure the continuity of the course by taping some of the sessions and training others to also teach the course. The course continues to be unique in public higher education institutions of our size which have an Honor System.

Helene, two HIPERs and one student Honor Council member will also be doing presentations at this year's Center for Academic Integrity Conference in San Diego in October. Helene continues to serve on the CAI Board of Directors and was instrumental, along with Loni Marietta, President of HIPE, in persuading the CAI Board to hold their annual conference at Kansas State University the weekend of October 9-11, 2004. We were clever enough to avoid a football weekend.

The Honor Council, Student Senate and Faculty Senate all approved proposed changes to the Constitution which will increase the number of Honor Council members from 34 to 44. The number of faculty and student Honor Council members for the College of Technology and Aviation will increase from two students and two faculty to four students and four faculty, which should make it less likely for potential conflicts of interest on the Salina campus during the adjudication process. We will continue to transport Honor Council members from the Manhattan campus to Salina for hearings. Also, the Dean of Student life will appoint three staff members to the Honor Council and the Associate Provost for Diversity will appoint three at-large students to the Honor Council, in an attempt to increase the diversity of Honor Council membership. The Honor System Constitution and ByLaws have been reprinted over the summer to reflect those changes and various ByLaws changes that have occurred during our first four years.

With the addition of a half-time staff position in our office, the Associate Director and the HIPERs have been able to greatly increase our visibility and ability to make presentations to faculty and student groups about the Honor System, explaining its purpose and the adjudication procedures. We already have scheduled dozens of presentations for the first few weeks of school, have contacted all the deans and department heads offering them presentations for their faculty, and anticipate we will again reach some thousands of those in the academic community.

Although the Graduate School has not yet become part of the Honor System, this past academic year has seen some movement in that direction. Both the Graduate School Dean and the Provost are in support of the Graduate School becoming part of the Honor System.

In 1999, just before our inaugural year, the Provost said that he hoped the Honor System would become part of the Kansas State University culture within five years. The 2003-2004 academic year will be our fifth year of operation and we believe we are in sight of that goal. The Honor System is built on four principles:

1. The Honor System retains the philosophical and financial support of the Provost;
2. The Honor System operates autonomously;
3. The Honor System is governed by equal numbers of student and faculty Honor Council members;
4. The Honor System employs a student development perspective.

The Honor System web site <[ksu.edu/honor](http://ksu.edu/honor)> continues to develop as an extensive and useful guide to many topics related to issues of academic dishonesty and has received over 24,000 visitors since October 1999. We believe it is the most comprehensive and useful academic honesty web site of any academic institution in the country.

Questions or comments can be directed to <[honor@ksu.edu](mailto:honor@ksu.edu)>, or visit us in our office, Fairchild Hall 215.

Respectfully Submitted,

Phil Anderson  
Honor System Director  
September 2003