```
┌─────────────────────────────────────────────┐
│                  MINUTES                      │
│ Kansas State University Faculty Senate Meeting│
│      Tuesday, October 11, 2005, 3:30 pm       │
│          K-State Union, Big 12 Room           │
└─────────────────────────────────────────────┘
```

Present: Adams, Behnke, Bergen, Blythe, Bontrager, Brigham, Brockway, Burns, Cauble, R. Clark, Clegg, Collins, Cox, DeLuccie, Devore, Dodd, Eiselein, Erickson, Fairchild, Frieman, Gehrt, Greene, Guzek, Hamilton, Hedrick, Herald, Hoag, Hohenbary, Holcombe, Johnston, Kearns, Knapp, Lee, Lehew, Leitnaker, Lynch, McHaney, Michie, Moore, Nagaraja, Nichols, North, Oberst, Pacey, Potts, Prince, Rahman, Ransom, Rietcheck, Rintoul, Ross, Sachs, Schultz, Schumm, Shubert, Shultis, Simon, Spears, Spikes, Spooner, Stadtlander, Stokes, Thompson, Trussell, Turnley, Turtle, Warner, Wilkie, Willbrant, Yahnke

Proxies: Alloway, Gormely, Hosni, Maatta, Maes, Reeck, Roozeboom, Smith, Stewart, and Stockham

Absent: Arck, Baker, Bhadriraju, G. Clark, Dhuyvetter, Fritz, Grauer, Haub, Higgins, Lovely, Martin, Rolley, Rys, and Staggenborg

Visitors: Phil Anderson, Al Cochran, Warren White, Judy Woellhof, Elizabeth Unger, and Lynn Carlin

I.   President Tom Herald called the meeting to order at 3:30 p.m.

II.   The minutes of the September 13, 2005 meeting were approved.

III.   Ombudsperson Report – **Attachment 1**
        Warren White provided a brief overview of the annual Ombudsperson Activities report. Judy Woellhof discussed a comparison between the 2004-05 report versus the 2005-06 report. The caseload has increased. The Workplace Climate and the Performance Evaluations were the top two categories in both years. This year there were no grievances filed where the previous year had three grievances. Betsy Cauble reported that she stopped taking cases in February when she became an interim department head, but she still had the most cases. She encouraged a quick selection for the replacement ombudsperson and encouraged the selection of someone of color. Senator Rahman asked about the faculty advocates that were recommended in the report. President Herald said that this was discussed last year with the administration and they are looking at how this can be accomplished along with possible compensation.

IV.   Honor System Report – **Attachment 2**
        Phil Anderson, former director of the Honor System, discussed the Honor System Annual Review – 2004/2005. The report does not include Helene Marcoux's report and he encouraged senators to review her detailed report on the Honor System web site.   The number of cases continues to increase and he believes that the academic community is becoming more aware of these issues and that we have a system to deal with these issues. Senator Pacey asked about the five students with second violations. He also asked about faculty who observed wandering eyes during an exam, and the appearance that does not normally hold up during the hearing. Phil Anderson said that at least one of the violators had two violations in close timing and the committee decided that other sanctions were more appropriate in this case. Phil Anderson indicated that highly disputed cases are difficult to hear but they are done fairly, from his observations. Senator Hedrick expressed concern about the academic integrity course. Anderson indicated that he and most students who have taken the course find it an excellent experience. He encouraged concerns about the course to be directed to Helene Marcoux and the new director, David Allen.

V.   Reports from Standing Committees

    A. Academic Affairs Committee – Alice Trussell

        1. Course and Curriculum Changes

            a. Undergraduate Education
                1. Senator Trussell moved to approve undergraduate course and curriculum changes approved by the College of Business Administration May 19, 2005:

a. Changes in receiving a minor in business
b. Changes in proposed enrollment management
c. Changes to current policy on Transfer Students
d. Changes to current policy of curriculum from other K-State Colleges (DOE to K-State Fall 2001 or later)
e. Changes to current policy on readmission qualifications of students dismissed from the College of Business Administration (DOE to K-State Fall 2001 or later)
f. Changes to current policy on reinstatement

Motion carried.

b. Graduate Education
1. Senator Trussell moved to approve graduate course and curriculum changes approved by the Graduate Council on September 6, 2005:

NEW
CE 745 Structural Dynamics
CE 824 Strength and Deformation of Geo-materials
CE 872 Transportation Safety
EECE 888 Power System Stability and Control
MANGT 660 Demand-Based Management for Supply Chain

Motion carried.

c. General Education
1. Senator Trussell moved to approve SPAN 165 (Accelerated Beginning) for UGE status.

Motion carried.

2. Senator Trussell moved to approve the May 2005 graduation list.

Motion carried.

3. Senator Trussell moved to approve additions to graduation lists:
August 2004
Stephanie Powers – BA from Arts and Sciences
Albert John Ghergich III – Bachelor of Fine Arts from Arts and Sciences

May 2005
Andrew R. Woody – BS from Arts and Sciences
Marie Elizabeth Schulte – BS from Arts and Sciences
Christopher C. Boggas – Arts & Sciences
Christopher Andrew Hannon –Technology & Aviation
Steven Carl Palmer – Technology & Aviation
Ryan Joshua Toma – Technology & Aviation
Kelsey Wayne Veer – Technology & Aviation
Kyle L. Martin – Technology & Aviation
Paul Ryan Hendrickson – Technology & Aviation

Motion carried.

4. CAPP
1. Academic Definitions, Prerequisites, etc. – **Attachment 3a**
Senator Trussell moved for the approval of Academic Definitions, Prerequisites, etc. Senator Johnston asked if the definition of prerequisites is also current practice. That was affirmed. Motion carried.

B. Faculty Affairs Committee – Frank Spikes

   1. Revised handbook language concerning English Language Assessment – **Attachment 4**
   Senator Spikes moved to approve the proposed changes to Section C 22.2 of the University Handbook. Senator Dodds asked who conducts the oral interview. Senator Spikes indicated the hiring department personnel conduct the interview. Senator Michie suggested that the word "potentially" in the last sentence of the policy be deleted as unnecessary. Senator Rahman expressed concern about the assessment of the English language proficiency. Senator Spooner suggested that this is just a normal process within the interview process. Senator DeLuccie asked if the interview would find that the individual is not assessed to be proficient in English, then could that be reason to not hire the individual. The candidate could choose to take the test so it could be an objective test. Senator Spears indicated that it was not the Board of Regents intention to allow the English language proficiency to be the deciding factor in the hire. Senator Rintoul indicated that the real change in the policy is that GTAs now have to pass the English competency test before they can teach a class, not just the faculty members. Motion carried.

   2. Guidelines for assessing spoken English language competency – **Attachment 5**
   These guidelines are provided for information only. No action is required.

   The committee passed a proposal from the Compensation Task force on the Professorial Award program and they plan to include this on the November agenda for approval. The committee also approved a proposal for a revised compensation policy for faculty teaching study abroad courses.   The committee is now working on specific University Handbook language for these two proposals.

C. Faculty Senate Committee on University Planning - Walter Schumm
   Senator Schumm reported the committee discussed the proposed TABOR amendment. He informed the committee about the new Export Control regulations as provided to leadership by the President's staff. They also discussed the benefit costs charged during the summer months. Faculty members paid from grants have the benefit costs charged to the grants during the summer months. Some universities are requiring donors to include maintenance costs in their donation for buildings. President Herald announced that the administration will speak to us about the Export Control regulations at a future Faculty Senate meeting.

D. Faculty Senate Committee on Technology – Michael North
   Senator North reported that the committee is working with the Information Resource Management Council (IRMC) to revise the policy on Technologically Enhanced Classrooms, PPM 3470, and a new policy for videoconferencing. He suggested that the InfoTech Tuesday electronic newsletter is a great communication device for information technology and encouraged senators and their co-workers to subscribe to this listserv by accessing: http://listserv.ksu.edu/web?SUBED1=infotechtuesday&A=1.

   One of the topics they have been discussing is the removal of Student ID (SID) on the Campus ID cards (normally the SSN,) beginning in June 2005. This removal no longer allows the positive identification of students taking a test using the Scantron system. He introduced Dr. Elizabeth Unger to further discuss the Campus ID card. Every card, old and new, has a 16-digit ISO number. When the Student ID # was removed from the card, the faculty could no longer match the ID# on the Scantron form with the Campus card. The temporary solution allows for the faculty member to request the class participants to use the last 9-digits of the ISO number on the Scantron form. If the faculty member doesn't need a positive ID verification, those faculty members will ask the student to use their Student ID # (SSN) on the Scantron form. Senator Rintoul indicated that he often has students who cannot write their SSN correctly anyway. He clarified at the beginning of the class that the faculty member would need to indicate exactly which number they should place on the Scantron form. He said that was very difficult considering there are multiple proctors for the multiple sections of large classes. He requested a program be written to match the Scantron ID# first with K-State On-line, then if there is not a match, the program should attempt to match with the ISO #. Dr. Unger indicated they would work directly with instructors of large courses, such as the introductory Biology course, to meet their needs. She indicated that the administration has developed several principles; one is to have at least one level of security between the ID card # and any administrative systems identifying #. There are more individuals beyond students, faculty and staff who need the ability to have an identification card for various uses, such as for the Library. The number should not be directly linked to the current or future systems. The solution should be numeric, in order to minimize the impact on K-State administrative systems and current Scantron forms. The number should be assigned randomly, rather than

sequentially. To meet the legal requirements, we must be able to do this within the next few weeks for faculty and staff, then for students next semester.

Some of the options being discussed are to use the Oracle E-Business Suite ID, the ISO number, the eID, and a randomly generated permanent number established at the same time that the eID is created. Senator Spooner indicated that the last solution is the best one. Dr. Unger reported that if any solution is chosen other than the Oracle ID, there will need to be a translation table built to translate the other ID to the Oracle ID. Senator Rintoul pointed out that this mistake on the part of the ID center is going to be very expensive to fix, and then asked how the solution is going to be determined. She indicated that Lynn Carlin, director of Data and Information Administration and Jennifer Gehrt, director of the LASER Project, are co-chairing a committee to determine the solution. She is also discussing this with other interested parties. Lynn Carlin was introduced and she indicated that she and Jennifer Gehrt are meeting with the various parties and will be narrowing the solution down and then determine all of the ramifications to processes and systems. Her research shows that the trend is for universities to establish a number that then follows the individual throughout their association with the university.

Senator Pacey asked about the KSU and the K-State domain names. Dr. Unger indicated that they are completely aliased. Individuals may use either KSU or K-State. There is no intention to eliminate either domain as we have been grandfathered to be allowed to use both domains. The reason that we moved to also use K-State is for marketing purposes and branding.

VI.   Announcements

   A. Faculty Senate Leadership Council
       See the Executive Committee Minutes.

   B. Kansas Board of Regents Meeting
       See the Executive Committee Minutes.

   C. Report from Student Senate
       Senator Moore reported that the students have created a tuition task force to look at the next five-year tuition strategy plan. They are also discussing the TABOR amendment and working with legislators before the 2006 session begins. Senator Burns reported that students will take an official stance on the TABOR amendment in the future.

   D. Other - None

VII.   Old Business - none

VIII. New Business - none

IX.   For the Good of the University
       President Herald announced that 32 pre-proposals were submitted for the Targeted Excellence program; once these have been reviewed by the panel the recommendations will be forwarded to the Provost by December 5.

       Senator Rahman announced that the Pakistan Student Association is collecting donations for the Earthquake fund. She will also accept those donations.

X.   The meeting was adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Brief Report to KSU Faculty Senate

Ombudsperson Activities
June 1, 2004 – May 31, 2005

Submitted by:

Betsy Cauble
Warren White
Judy Woellhof

The confidential nature of the ombudsperson relationship requires that the identity of the client be protected. There is no specific information about any individual or their status. All conversations, actions, and outcomes are privileged information and appear as aggregate data.

This report represents the ombudspersons' activities from June 1, 2004 to May 31, 2005. We have chosen to combine the activities of the three ombudspersons in order to provide a complete picture of activity and protect the confidentiality of all parties.

Summary:

We saw 45 cases involving 217 hours and 50 minutes:

Ombudsperson	# Cases	%	Hours:Min.	%
BC	22	48.9%	125:10	57.5
WW	16	35.5%	54:55	25.2
JW	7	15.6%	37:45	17.3
Total	**45**	**100.0**	**217:50**	**100.0**

Of the 45 cases:

Men	33 (53.2%)	Graduate Students	2	(3.2%)
Women	29 (46.8%)	Unclassified Professionals	22	(35.5%)
Minorities	4 (6.5%)	Faculty (Tenured/Tenure Track)	38	(61.3%)
Groups	4	Total	62	(100.0%)

Nature of complaints (60 complaints in 10 categories):

Workplace Climate	17 (28.3%)	Performance Evaluations	9	(15.0%)
Promotion and Tenure	5 (8.3%)	Work Load	1	(1.6%)
Compensation	7 (11.7%)	Appointment	4	(6.7%)
Contract	6 (10.0%)	Sexual Harassment	0	(0.0%)
Discrimination	7 (11.7%)	Inquiry	4	(6.7%)

There were no cases referred to mediation and three cases were referred to Rusty Andrews, Human Systems Consultant. All cases came from the Manhattan campus including seven colleges and several administrative units. We are aware of four cases where individuals left the University.

General Observations:

- Resolutions can be extremely time consuming and elusive;
- Locating faculty advocates for grievances is VERY difficult and **must be addressed**;
- Of the 19 cases that were resolved, 4 individuals left the university; either contracts were not renewed or the individuals left because they were unhappy with their situation;
- Creating balanced caseloads for ombudspersons continues to be problematic. In a meeting with Faculty Senate Leadership on August 15, 2005, we discussed a plan to redistribute cases. We agreed on a trial basis to refer new cases to another ombudsperson when we are overcommitted. We will track the data and analyze the results at the end of the year to determine if this is a viable solution.

Table 1. Caseload Activity by Issue, Time, and Resolution

Case	Issue	Time	Resolution			
			Grievance	**Pending**	**Resolved**	**Unknown**
1	Workplace Climate/Evaluation/Discrimination	7:00			X	
2	Workplace Climate/Evaluation/Discrimination	6:30		X		
3	Workplace Climate/Appointment	12:30		X		
4	Workplace Climate/Appointment	6:00		X		
5	Workplace Climate/Discrimination	4:15				X
6	Workplace Climate	15:30		X		
7	Workplace Climate	6:45		X		
8	Workplace Climate	6:00			X	
9	Workplace Climate	5:30			X	
10	Workplace Climate	3:00		X		
11	Workplace Climate	2:20		X		
12	Workplace Climate	1:30		X		
13	Workplace Climate	1:15				X
14	Workplace Climate	:10			X	
15	Promotion & Tenure/Discrimination	15:30			X	
16	Promotion & Tenure	15:45		X		
17	Promotion & Tenure	6:30		X		
18	Promotion & Tenure	6:00			X	
19	Promotion & Tenure	:10				X
20	Compensation/Evaluation/Workplace Climate	13:15		X		
21	Compensation/Appointment	4:30				X
22	Compensation	12:00		X		
23	Compensation	4:00			X	
24	Compensation	2:00		X		
25	Compensation	1:30		X		
26	Compensation	:15			X	
27	Compensation	:10			X	
28	Contract/Workplace Environment/Evaluation	15:45		X		
29	Contract/Workplace Environment/Evaluation	:15		X		
30	Contract/Evaluation	12:00			X	
31	Contract	1:45			X	
32	Contract	1:30				X
33	Contract	1:00			X	
34	Discrimination	7:45			X	
35	Discrimination	3:30				X
36	Discrimination	2:25			X	
37	Performance Evaluation	3:10			X	
38	Performance Evaluation	1:35			X	
39	Performance Evaluation	:45			X	
40	Work Load	2:20			X	
41	Appointment	3:00			X	
42	Inquiry	:30				X
43	Inquiry	:20				X
44	Inquiry	:15				X
45	Inquiry	:10				X
Total		217:50	0.0%	35.6%	42.2%	22.2%

ATTACHMENT 2
KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY HONOR SYSTEM

Annual Review - 2004/2005

Education, Consultation, Mediation, Adjudication:
We do it all with student development in mind.*

* The Honor System motto, originated by members of the Honesty and Integrity Peer Educators (HIPE)

Article VI of our By Laws (now named *Investigation & Adjudication Procedures)* 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 2004/2005 academic year.

The primary purpose of the Honor System is to promote academic honesty as the cornerstone of our university's academic integrity. When called upon to help defend academic integrity, our secondary purpose is to provide the organizational structure of the Honor Council to investigate and adjudicate allegations of Honor Pledge violations.

Helene Marcoux's report (distributed separately) will focus on our Honor System's activities in promoting and educating the academic community; my report will focus on our investigation and adjudication procedures of Honor Pledge violations.

During the 2004/2005 academic year there were 123 Honor System Violation Reports submitted to our office, involving 162 Kansas State University undergraduate, graduate, and distance education students. The total number of cases increased 38% from the previous year. Of the 162 students alleged to have violated the Honor Pledge, 109 were male and 53 were female, which supports national research suggesting that males are more likely to violate the Honor Pledge than females.

Plagiarizing was the single most common Honor Pledge violation and was the chief factor in 77 cases. Usually the plagiarized source was from the Internet and faculty have become more adept at detecting those transgressions. Occasionally students plagiarize the work of other students, claiming only to want to see, "how you completed the assignment." Students who unwittingly share their completed work with other students are usually surprised to discover they have provided unauthorized aid and will need to defend their actions before an Honor Council Hearing Panel, which will likely take a dim view of the situation. Numerous faculty have mentioned their interest in the University subscribing to Turnitin.com, a web site which detects plagiarized work. The Provost is aware of that interest although the cost of subscribing is considerable (approximately $12,000 annually) for a university of our size.

Unauthorized collaboration on assignments was the second most common violation. When adjudicating those cases, Hearing Panels examine closely what is stated in the course syllabus as well as any written instructions that may appear on the assignment itself or were verbalized during class. We've discovered that students often take a too casual approach to the specifics of course syllabi, not recognizing that the syllabus is a contract and becomes one of the factors in determining whether an Honor Pledge violation has occurred. One faculty member was so concerned with this casual approach by students that he began implementing a quiz based on the course requirements as stated in the syllabus. The reader may be interested in the strategies of other KSU faculty by going to our web site <ksu.edu/honor> and clicking on "Faculty Tips" and then on "Best Practices." Those faculty who encourage and allow collaboration should read Richard Fogg's carefully crafted instructions regarding collaboration on assignments. We constantly remind students, when in doubt about the specifics of an assignment, please ask the course Instructor.

Other Honor Pledge violations included providing false information on an assignment by falsifying an interview; falsifying a returned test, claiming it was inaccurately graded; falsely claiming to have completed an exam in a large lecture class; or falsely claiming to be present in class by having a friend sign the attendance roster.

Subsequent forms of cheating involved unauthorized notes during an exam or copying the exam of a neighbor. In most large lecture classes where monitoring tests can be difficult due to crowded classrooms and close proximity between students, most faculty provide multiple versions of the same exam so that test copying is discouraged, although we continue to receive cases involving students who unwittingly copy test answers of a neighbor who has a different version

of the exam. In addition, some faculty require that students write the names of those persons sitting to the left, right, front and back, so that test cheating is more likely to be detected and/or curtailed.

Faculty should also be aware of recent electronic innovations such as cell phones that can create and transmit pictures or text messages to other like devices. I believe our Faculty Senate Technology Committee should consider placing a university sign in all classrooms that requires electronic devices to be turned off during class so that they don't cause a disturbance and can't be used for purposes of unauthorized aid.

We have observed that students are becoming more involved in detecting Honor Pledge violations and initiating occasional action to curtail it, usually alerting the Instructor of the problem. Frequently, a student may serve as the catalyst by calling the Instructor's attention to a possible Honor Pledge violation; the Instructor, however, becomes the Reporter for the case, while the student likely would become a witness to the occurrence. In one case, a student caught another student plagiarizing a piece of art created by the first student. Because the incident took place outside of a classroom, the Honor System did not have jurisdiction to decide the matter, however, both the new Director and Associate Director helped to negotiate a reasonable settlement between the involved parties. Another case involved a stolen photo, used as part of a class assignment. A third case involved a student who allegedly stole the class notes of another student. After consulting with KSU police, it was determined that the reported action may have constituted burglary and theft; the reporting student, however, declined to press charges and the case was dropped.

The most serious breach of the Honor Pledge involved a student, also employed as an ITAC technician, who gained access to an Associate Professor's electronic grade book and altered grades. The Associate Professor discovered the grade alterations and confronted the student. The student admitted changing grades in the course and received an XF as a result, plus the recommendation by the Associate Professor that the student be dismissed from the University. The student was also relieved of employment with ITAC. An Honor Council Hearing Panel heard the case and recommended to the Provost that the student be suspended from the University for a period of one year, after which the student would be allowed to re-enroll in classes. In addition, the student was required to immediately enroll in just the Academic Integrity course. During the 2006-2007 academic year, the student will perform community service by making 10 speaking presentations to a variety of student groups on the importance of honesty and integrity in one's academic work. The Provost is expected to follow the Hearing Panel's recommendation. The Director of ITAC also demanded written apologies to various supervisors including Vice Provost Unger and in addition, implemented a code of ethics which all ITAC employees must agree to abide by and sign a letter of acknowledgment. ITAC will also notify all faculty who have an ITAC employee in their class, of that person's name and that the student knows not to access the course grade book or any other information which would constitute a breach of ethics and integrity. ITAC also intends to monitor ITAC employee logs to help ensure the integrity of our electronic data.

Students who violated the Honor Pledge had the following majors, placed in descending order by college:

<div align="center">

Arts & Sciences 45
Engineering 37
Agriculture 21
Human Ecology 18
Business Administration 14
Open 11
Education 9
Technology & Aviation 4
Architecture 3
Distance Education 2

</div>

The number of reported Honor Pledge violations, however, occurred in descending order by college:

<div align="center">

Arts & Sciences 102
Engineering 27
Agriculture 15
Human Ecology 9
Business Administration 6
Technology & Aviation 4
Education 1
Distance Education 2
Architecture 0

</div>

Based on those numbers, one supposition might be that students are more likely to cheat in a class which is not in their major; most likely an Arts & Sciences course.

Faculty reported Honor Pledge violations in the following ratio:

Professors 14
Associate Professors 31
Assistant Professors 30
Instructors 21
Lab Directors 1
GTAs 25

Violations were reported in the following ratio by class size:

Large class (100 plus students) --20 cases
Medium class (25-99 students) --49 cases
Small class (1-24 students) --82 cases
Distance Education (Internet course) --2 cases

Violations were reported in the following ratio by year in school:

Freshmen 42
Sophomores 29
Juniors 44
Seniors 38
Graduate Students 8

In most cases, faculty who discover violations of the Honor Pledge handle the matter themselves by sanctioning the student(s) and then filling out the Honor System Violation Report Form (available at our web site <ksu.edu/honor>. When the report is received, the Director writes the student(s) a letter informing them of the allegation and providing the student(s) the right to contest. The student(s) is also invited to make an appointment with Helene Marcoux, the Associate Director, who reviews the report with the student and explains their rights under the Honor System. If the student wishes to contest the allegation, the Director is informed and the investigation and adjudication process is initiated. Students can only contest whether there has been an Honor Pledge violation; they cannot contest the severity of the sanction imposed by faculty. Most cases are settled without the need of an investigation and hearing. Of our 123 cases, 104 were handled entirely by faculty and reported to the Honor System. Most of the remaining cases went through the case investigation and adjudication stage.

Faculty also have the option of turning a case over to the Honor System for investigation and adjudication. Some faculty do not wish to be burdened with the sanctioning decision or otherwise believe that an Honor Council Hearing Panel will arrive at a more fair decision. One exceptionally difficult case involved a GTA who determined that one student copied the exam of another student in the class. The student adamantly denied the allegation, however, during a lengthy investigation, inconsistencies began to arise and it appeared that two other students may have been involved in a conspiracy. The Case Investigators' report eventually totaled twelve pages plus additional documentation which convinced the Hearing Panel that the accused student was not telling the truth and they doubted the veracity of the other two students as well. The Hearing lasted for 3 and one-half hours followed by another 90 minutes of deliberation. The accused student was suspended from the University until spring 2006 semester, although the student was allowed to take the Academic Integrity course during summer 2005. The other two students were not charged due to insufficient information. The suspended student later admitted to the Director that all three had lied about what had occurred.

In five cases it was discovered that the student had received a second Honor Pledge violation which automatically calls for an Honor Council Hearing Panel to determine whether an additional sanction would be appropriate. None of the five students had previously taken the Academic Integrity course. In two cases Hearing Panels recommended that the Provost suspend the students for one semester from the University. The students will be allowed to re-enroll in classes at the end of the suspension period. Another student was expelled for one year after falsely claiming to have taken exams in two classes for which there was no record. The Professors and Assistant Professor for both classes established a thorough and

reliable system for tracking students and their exams and it was clear that the student's claim of having taken the exams was obviously false. The remaining two cases resulted in the student's having to immediately enroll in the Academic Integrity course and complete community service in the form of a series of speaking engagements to various student groups on the importance of academic honesty and integrity.

In two cases, the Honor Council Case Investigators were able to conclude that sufficient information did not exist to support the charge of an Honor Pledge violation. When that happens, the Reporter is asked to meet with the Case Investigators so that they can explain how they arrived at their conclusion. In both cases, the faculty Reporter accepted their decision and the cases were dropped.

During this past academic year, the Honor Council was asked to consider and approve the following constitutional change:

Article I. #2 of the Honor System Constitution: *In order to provide students the right to address allegations of academic dishonesty,* all members of the academic community, both students and faculty, ~~are urged to~~ report violations of the Honor Pledge *to the office of the Honor System. Violations that result in an academic sanction being imposed must be reported. An academic sanction is any action that would lower a student's grade on an assignment or for the course.*

An Honor Pledge violation must be reported when:

a. A faculty member alleges a violation and imposes an academic sanction.
b. A faculty member alleges a violation and requests an investigation and hearing.
c. A student or faculty member suspects an Honor Pledge violation and requests an investigation. The case investigation concludes once a decision has been made whether there is sufficient information to proceed to the adjudication stage.

An Honor Pledge violation may not need to be reported when:

a. A faculty member alleges a violation and issues a warning but imposes no academic sanction.
b. A faculty member alleges a violation, issues a warning and provides the student an opportunity to correct the transgression, but imposes no academic sanction.
c. A faculty member alleges a violation, issues a warning and provides an opportunity for the student to redo the assignment or exam, but imposes no academic sanction.

The primary reason for this amendment is to provide students the right to contest allegations of Honor Pledge violations, to have the allegations investigated and adjudicated according to established Honor System procedures.

The second reason for this amendment is to be able to track repeat Honor Pledge violators.

The third reason for this amendment is to protect faculty from legal redress by following established academic procedures.

The fourth reason is to help promote academic integrity and to help students grow in ethical development.

This amendment will require the approval of both Faculty Senate and Student Senate. I have also asked the new Director, Dave Allen, and the Associate Director, Helene Marcoux, to offer this amendment once again to the current Honor Council for their approval.

I would like to once again express my sincere thanks to former Provost James R. Coffman for his trust in naming me the first Honor System Director. His original charge and hope was that the Honor System would become part of the Kansas State University culture within five years. I believe we have met that goal.

Provost Duane Nellis named former Honor Council member Dr. Dave Allen to be the new Honor System Director, beginning fall 2005 semester. Dr. Allen proved to be one of our most effective Honor Council members, frequently serving most capably as a Case Investigator and on Hearing Panels. Whenever we had a particularly difficult or sensitive case, we called on Dr. Allen to play a key role in helping resolve the issue. I have no doubt that Dr. Allen will prove to be an outstanding choice as Honor System Director.

And finally, I'd like the university community to know of my admiration, respect, trust and fondness for Helene Marcoux, the Associate Director, who has been involved in every aspect of the Honor System's development during its first seven years and who is truly the heart and soul of our Honor System. Helene, and the new Director, Dave Allen, have already established a strong working relationship and I believe their partnership will improve and enhance academic integrity at Kansas State University.

Phil Anderson
Honor System Director 1998-2005
September 2005

Course prerequisite (Pr.): a requirement that a student must satisfy before he/she is permitted to enroll in that course. This requirement can be one or any combination of the following: complete one or more lower level courses (if no grade specified, earn at least a P, CR, or D grade in the prerequisite course); complete a lower level course with a grade specified (C,B,A); a specified class rank for the student (sophomore, junior, senior), or instructor's permission.

Course recommended prerequisite (Rec. Pr.): a requirement a student need not satisfy before enrolling in the course, but recommended in order to enhance the student's learning of the course material.

Corequisite (Coreq.): a concurrent requirement (course, practicum, etc.), which must be completed at the same time, during the same session, as the course with which it is listed as a corequisite.

Course prerequisite or corequisite (Pr. or Coreq.): a requirement of one or more courses in which a student should either complete with the appropriate grade prior to enrolling in this course, or take concurrently with this course.

ATTACHMENT 4
Proposed Change in University Handbook

Background

In 1996 the Board of Regents adopted a policy requiring that prospective faculty members and graduate teaching assistants have their language capability assessed. Minimum scores on the TSE or SPEAK test were established. Faculty members or graduate teaching assistants who scored below this minimum could not be appointed without spoken English language remediation. Changes in the scoring standards of the TSE/SPEAK test combined with the results of a Legislative Audit conducted of all Regents' institutions in Fall 2004 lead the Board of Regents to modify this policy. The proposed changes to C22.2 of the University Handbook reflect the changes in the Board of Regents Policy.

Current Policy

C22.2 All prospective faculty members and graduate assistants will have their language capability assessed in accordance with Kansas Board of Regents' policies. Prospective faculty members found to be potentially deficient will be required to achieve prescribed minimum scores on the TSE or SPEAK. The Regents' policy provides that the minimum score for appointment is 240. Individuals must have scored at or above the prescribed minimum on the SPEAK, to be appointed without spoken English language remediation conditions. (BOR 6-27-96)

Proposed Policy

C22.2 All prospective faculty members and graduate teaching assistants will have their spoken English competency assessed in accordance with Kansas Board of Regents' policies. Prospective faculty members are to have such an assessment performed on a face-to-face basis at the time of the on-campus interview or by mediated means in the instance of telephone interviews. Graduate teaching assistants will have such an assessment interview performed upon their arrival for their first semester on campus. An oral interview is to be conducted by no fewer than three institutional personnel, one of whom shall be a student. Prospective teaching personnel found to be deficient in speaking ability will be required to achieve a minimum score of 50 on the Test of Spoken English (TSE) or the Speaking Proficiency English Assessment Kit (SPEAK) in order to be appointed to teaching responsibilities without first completing spoken English language remediation. (BOR 1-19-05; BOR 6-27-96)

ATTACHMENT 5
Guidelines for assessing spoken English language competency

General features of speech to assess:

Vocabulary/Grammar/Fluency
Loudness/Rapidity of Speech
Enunciation
Clarity of Expression
Skill in Explaining Concepts

A score of 50 or better on the SPEAK test is necessary to demonstrate spoken English competency. The following are features on the SPEAK test that correspond to scores of 50 and scores of 60.

Score of 50:

Speaker exhibits the following traits with regard to selection of vocabulary, control of grammatical structure, accurate pronunciation, and delivery:

- Errors are not unusual, but rarely major
- Accent may be slightly distracting
- There is some range in grammatical structure and vocabulary, which may be slightly distracting
- Delivery is generally smooth, with hesitancy and pauses

Communication is generally effective; tasks are performed competently, little listener effort is required

- Speaker is able to select reasonable language for the task
- Speaker generally uses appropriate response to audience/situation
- Response is generally coherent, with generally clear, logical organization, adequate development and some effective use of cohesive devices (e.g. however, therefore, after that, nevertheless, etc.)
- Speaker uses linguistic features that are generally effective; communication is generally not affected by errors

Score of 60:

Speaker exhibits the following traits with regard to selection of vocabulary, control of grammatical structure, accurate pronunciation, and delivery:

- Errors not noticeable
- Accent not distracting
- Range in grammatical structure and vocabulary
- Delivery often has native-like smoothness

Communication is almost always effective; tasks are performed very competently, almost no listener effort is required

- Speaker is highly skillful in selecting appropriate language for the task
- Speaker uses appropriate response to audience/situation
- Response is coherent, with logical organization, clear development and effective use of cohesive devices
- Speaker uses linguistic features that are almost always effective; communication is not affected by minor errors

Note: A score of 60 does not mean that the person must speak perfectly with absolutely no accent. It means that the minor language problems do not interfere with communication at all.