

Following the selection of the QEP theme, the Committee sought additional information to assist in identifying important ethical issues and developing a plan to address them. A survey designed for this purpose was sent to Deans, department chairs, and administrators of academic-support units; a shorter survey was made available to individual members of the campus community (Appendix C). Responses to the ethics survey represented eight of the eleven colleges and schools, twenty academic departments, and fourteen academic support units. The survey results, summarized in a later section of this document, were used to develop the QEP goals and implementation plan.

Throughout the QEP development process, progress reports were posted on the university SACS web site, along with contact information for members of the QEP Committee. Faculty, staff, students, administrators, and others were invited to provide input by contacting a member of the Committee. During the 2004 Fall Semester, the entire university community had the opportunity to review a draft of the QEP and offer comments and suggestions for revision.

Definition of Student Learning

The principal target for the QEP is the improvement of teaching and learning. Student learning, as suggested in the SACS Handbook for Reaffirmation of Accreditation (2003), is defined broadly to include “changes in students’ knowledge, skills, behaviors, and/or values that may be attributable to the collegiate experience” (p. 19). The campus conversation on ethics will improve the climate for student learning by:

- *Providing ethical learning environments that are transparent, inclusive, and free from harassment and coercion*

- *Strengthening commitment to academic integrity on the part of both faculty and students*
- *Creating a “level playing field” in which students are evaluated fairly on the basis of their own academic accomplishments*
- *Encouraging ethical pedagogies that accommodate students’ different learning styles and enhance critical thinking skills*
- *Promoting student engagement in the learning process through experiential activities and other relevant and practical learning opportunities*

Importance/Institutional Context

The QEP is consistent with the Texas Tech mission statement:

As a comprehensive public research university, Texas Tech University is committed to teaching and the advancement of knowledge by providing the highest standards of excellence in higher education, fostering intellectual and personal development, and stimulating meaningful research and service to humankind. (*Texas Tech University Catalog, 2004-2005, p. 2*)

A “campus conversation on ethics” will address the University’s mission by helping students develop a personal set of ethical standards to provide guidance for life-long decision-making. It will give students the opportunity to develop the knowledge and skills they need to apply ethical principles to real-world concerns, and produce graduates who are capable of ethical leadership and responsible citizenship.

Clearly, students will learn to “do the right thing” only within the context of an institution that models ethical behavior. A conversation that starts at the top will foster a climate of concern for ethical behavior throughout the university and serve to inform faculty, staff, and administrators on ethical issues with respect to their relationships with students, as well as each other. It also will help to define the public image of Texas Tech as an institution that strives to practice and teach integrity within the university

community and beyond. As one department chair stated in his response to the ethics survey:

A strong ethical climate enhances the opportunities for learning... When an institution can project an image of excellence, and instill in its students a sense of excellence, ethics must follow because unethical behavior does not lead to excellence. It may lead to short term gain, but it does not lead to excellence...

Several university operating policies address standards of conduct for university officers and employees, including a policy on ethics that is required by the State Legislature. The Ethics Policy was adopted by the Board of Regents in 1995 and revised by the Vice Chancellor and General Counsel in 2004 (OP 10.11, Texas Tech University Operating Policies and Procedures). The Policy reinforces laws, government regulations, and other University policies that either require or prohibit certain activities (e.g., affirmative action, nepotism, sexual harassment, use of institutional funds for political purposes, accepting gifts and honoraria, and private use of university facilities and equipment). Because it defines ethical behavior, essentially, as compliance with laws and regulations, OP 10.11 provides limited guidance for “doing the right thing” in the broader sense.

The ethics initiative reflects the interests of the entire university community; has the potential to involve all academic and academic-support units; and has strong support from faculty, students, staff, administrators, and other stakeholder groups. It represents an effective use of resources by building on initiatives already underway or planned, including the following:

- Texas Tech is a member of the Center for Academic Integrity (CAI), headquartered at the Kenan Institute of Ethics at Duke University. CAI offers a variety of services to member institutions, including assistance in assessing

- academic integrity policies and practices, and professional development for faculty. (www.academicintegrity.org)
- The Academic Integrity Task Force recently submitted a report on ways to strengthen the university's culture of academic integrity. Implementation of the Task Force recommendations are underway. (See Appendix D for Executive Summary.)
 - A number of academic departments require courses in ethics for undergraduate and/or graduate students. For example, the Texas State Board of Public Accountancy recently instituted a rule requiring Accounting students to take a course in ethics in order to sit for the CPA exam. The Rawls College of Business Administration is considering expanding this requirement to other majors.
 - The Murdough Center for Engineering Professionalism in the College of Engineering provides education on engineering ethics and professionalism, including an annual "Engineering Ethics Day." The Center houses the National Institute for Engineering Ethics (NIEE). (www.murdough.ttu.edu)
 - The Service Learning Strategic Plan encourages the development of service learning courses in all academic programs. Such courses can provide opportunities for students to confront ethical issues in the real world. (<http://www.tlhc.ttu.edu/servicelearning/sites/sl.pdf>)
 - The "Report of the Gender Issues Committee" (2004) includes a number of recommendations for improving the status of women faculty, staff, and students, and ensuring that the University is gender and family friendly.

- One of the goals of the current University Strategic Plan (<http://www.ttu.edu/stratplan/goals/1.php>) is to increase student diversity to more closely reflect Texas population demographics. Increasing the higher education participation rate of the state's minority populations also is a major thrust of "Closing the Gaps: The Texas Higher Education Plan" (2000). It is projected that nearly 80% of the 500,000 additional students expected to enter Texas colleges by the year 2015 will be Black or Hispanic
- As a public institution, Texas Tech has an ethical obligation, not only to recruit students from diverse backgrounds, but also to establish an inclusive environment in which all students have the opportunity to be successful. A recent study conducted by the Diversity Strategic Planning Committee (Cannon, 2003) revealed several areas of concern with regard to the perceived campus climate for members of racial minority groups. (See Appendix E for Executive Summary.)
- Texas Tech faculty and administrators participate in the annual West Texas Ethical Leadership Conference, held annually.

Best Practices

In the aftermath of recent ethical lapses in corporate America, many colleges and universities have focused new attention on their unique ethical responsibilities. Candace de Russy, in a 2003 article in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*, noted that "professional ethics begin on the college campus" (p. B20). Colleges and universities must accept some of the responsibility for corporate scandals, de Russy asserted, for it is in college that many future accountants, lawyers, and other professionals receive their first exposure to ethical standards and traditions.

Davis (2004) challenged those who control the academies to correct the “faulty organizational structures that enable irresponsible actions” (p. 8). According to Davis, governing boards should establish clear standards for ethical behavior and ensure compliance with those standards, put systems in place to encourage honest scholarship and academic integrity, implement safeguards to ensure that faculty do not exploit their power relationships with students, and provide funding for ethics education.

The call for universities to take ethics seriously is not new. More than two decades ago, Harvard President Derek Bok urged institutions of higher education to recommit to earlier academic traditions when students’ moral development was considered an integral part of their mission (Bok, 1984). Bok suggested that, when a university refuses to take this responsibility seriously, it “violates its basic obligations to society...and gives an impression of moral indifference...” (p. 79).

The QEP Committee sought information about ethics initiatives in higher education by reviewing published literature, communicating with peer institutions, and examining web sites of leading ethics centers. The following examples represent some of the best practices that served as models for developing the QEP implementation plan.

Codes of Ethics

A number of universities have addressed their unique ethical responsibilities in an institutional code of ethics. The Code of Ethics recently adopted by the University of Southern California (USC, 2004) is a good example. The USC Code states: “We try to do what is right even when no one is watching us or compelling us to do the right thing” (p. 1). The Code identifies specific ethical responsibilities such as nurturing an environment of mutual respect and tolerance, attending to the well-being of students and others who

are vulnerable, and distinguishing between behavior that is ethical and that which is merely legal. It holds all members of the “Trojan Family,” students to trustees, responsible both for the ethics of their own behavior and for building an ethical institution.

Codes of ethics used to promote ethical teaching practices reflect the unique nature of the student-teacher relationship and recognize that teaching, essentially, is an ethical undertaking. A number of universities in Canada and some in the U.S. have adopted “Ethical Principles in University Teaching,” developed in 1996 by Canada’s Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education (STLHE). The nine principles of ethical teaching, outlined in the STLHE document, include content competence, pedagogical competence, confidentiality, intellectual development of students, valid student assessment, dealing with sensitive topics, dual-role relationships with students, respect for colleagues, and respect for the institution (“Ethical Principles,” 1996.)

Universities also have adopted codes of ethics to deal with other ethical issues. For example, Duke was the first American university to develop a code of conduct for the companies it licenses to manufacture Duke apparel. More than 100 universities have followed Duke’s lead (Colby, Ehrlich, Beaumont, & Stephens, 2003).

Academic Integrity Initiatives

Technology-enhanced plagiarism and other forms of academic dishonesty are growing concerns on most campuses. Studies have shown that cheating is common among college students and that some forms, such as cheating on exams and unpermitted collaboration on written assignments, have increased dramatically over the last three decades (McCabe, Trevino, & Butterfield, 2001).

Similar results have been reported for high school students. A recent study published by *Who's Who Among High School Students* indicated that 80% of college-bound students had cheated in high school. Most said they had never been caught and more than half did not consider cheating a serious transgression (cited in *Fundamental Values*, 1999). Michael Josephson, President of the Josephson Institute on Ethics:

The scary thing is that so many kids are entering the workforce to become corporate executives, politicians, airplane mechanics, and nuclear inspectors with the dispositions and skills of cheaters and thieves.
(*Ethics of American Youth*, 2002, p. 1)

The Center for Academic Integrity (CAI), affiliated with the Duke University's Kenan Institute for Ethics, provides a forum to affirm and promote the values of academic integrity. Academic integrity is defined by CAI as "a commitment, even in the face of adversity, to five fundamental values: honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility..." (*Fundamental Values*, 1999, p. 4). CAI supports research and disseminates information about academic integrity, assists institutions in assessing the campus climate of academic integrity, provides professional development for faculty on academic integrity issues, and sponsors an annual conference. The Center has more than 300 institutional members.

Student honor codes. Some universities have implemented student honor codes as one way to stem the rising tide of academic dishonesty. The Code of Academic Integrity at the University of Maryland is one good example. The Maryland Code is described as a "modified honor code governed by an all-student honor council" (*Faculty Commitment*, 2003, p. 4). It provides strict penalties for dishonesty, but also has a strong educational component. Maryland faculty members are encouraged to implement a voluntary honor pledge in all classes.

Studies suggest that honor codes can reduce academic dishonesty by conveying a consistent message to students that ethical behavior is expected. They also promote student involvement in broader ethical issues and help to create ethical campus communities (Colby, et al., 2003; McCabe, et al., 2001). In addition, there is some evidence that collegiate honor codes may have an enduring effect that extends beyond the educational environment (McCabe, Trevino, & Butterfield, 1996).

However, honor codes alone cannot solve the problem of academic dishonesty. According to McCabe, et al. (2001), we should not assume that students will commit themselves to honor codes and other academic integrity policies on their own. Faculty members are considered one key to effective implementation. As a recent report to the faculty from Maryland's Student Honor Council states: "It isn't possible to maintain high academic integrity standards if significant numbers of faculty lack commitment..." (cited in Faculty Commitment, 2003, p. 2).

Experiential Learning

Scholars have argued that service learning and other experiential pedagogies are more effective for teaching ethics than traditional modes of instruction (Boss, 1994; Colby, et al., 2003, Fleckenstein, 1997; Saltmarsh, 1997). Some researchers (cited in Fleckenstein) have reported that traditional methods of teaching ethics may actually produce a decline in students' moral reasoning skills. Experiential learning, on the other hand, can personalize and legitimize traditional classroom teaching by giving students opportunities to consider the broader social dimensions of ethical issues.

As Saltmarsh (1997) notes, traditional classroom methods can teach students to think about ethics, but it is only through the process of reflective inquiry and dialogue

that they learn to recognize real-life ethical issues and develop the commitment to make ethical choices. Saltmarsh recommends this process which he calls “connected knowing,” not only as a tool to teach ethics, but also as an ethical way to teach.

Student-Centered Initiatives

We found a variety of national initiatives that provide opportunities for students to become involved in ethics projects. Following are two examples.

The Association for Practical and Professional Ethics (APPE) offers a variety of activities for students in conjunction with the Association’s Annual Meeting. These include a paper competition for undergraduates, a seminar for graduate students, and a National Intercollegiate Ethics Bowl, inspired by TV’s College Bowl. Ethics Bowl teams prepare for debate on case studies representing ethical dilemmas on a wide range of issues, from academic integrity to professional ethics to social/political issues such as free speech. Forty teams competed in Ethics Bowl 2004, with Indiana University winning the championship.

“A Matter of Ethics” is a national project spearheaded by the Association of College Honor Societies (ACHS). Launched at the 2004 Annual Meeting, the project encourages members of campus honor societies to work together to provide leadership for ethics programs and activities. Project objectives include increasing campus awareness of ethical standards, promoting dialogue among student groups regarding ethical issues, strengthening commitment to ethical behavior among peers, providing opportunities for ethical leadership, and increasing understanding of professional codes of ethics within the various academic disciplines (“A Matter of Ethics,” 2004).

Ethics Centers

Both public and private universities have established ethics centers to provide leadership for programs and activities that support the study and teaching of ethics and contribute to an ethical campus community. The QEP Committee identified several university-based ethics centers that provide models (Appendix F).

An examination of web sites for these ethics centers indicate that, although mission statements and goals vary, most appear to be broadly conceived to serve as a resource for the entire campus community and beyond. The web site for the Rutland Center at Clemson, for example, states that it “provides the campus and the community with a forum for exploration and discussion of ethical issues....and serves as a resource for the people and institutions of the state and region...” Cornell’s Program on Ethics and Public Life is described on its web site as serving the entire Cornell community and seeking to influence national and international debates by encouraging connections to the world beyond. The Kenan Institute web site identifies four foci: ethics across the curriculum; ethics in campus life; ethics in education, K-12 through university; and ethics within and across communities.

Implementation Plan

Responses to the campus-wide ethics survey designed to identify important ethical issues revealed four general areas of concern:

- ***Issues related to institutional policies and practices***, including: ethical consequences of university policies, ethical considerations in the conduct of university business (e.g., investment practices, environmental issues), confidentiality and privacy issues, responsible use of financial resources, meeting

the challenges of the “democratization” of higher education, and ensuring that institutional integrity is not compromised by self-interest (e.g., financial gain, public approval, government favor).

- ***Academic integrity issues***, including: internet-enhanced plagiarism, cheating on tests and assignments, student ignorance regarding plagiarism and other forms of academic dishonesty, student apathy toward academic dishonesty and its consequences, and unclear and ineffective policies and procedures for responding to academic misconduct.
- ***Curricular issues***, including: incorporation of ethics into the undergraduate program, emphasizing enlightenment rather than indoctrination, teaching students to think critically about ethical issues, increasing student access to ethics courses by making additional resources available, ensuring ethical behavior in conducting research and disseminating research results, and addressing issues specific to academic disciplines (e.g., environmental issues, use of natural resources, genetic manipulation, engineering ethics).
- ***Diversity and equity issues, including***: serving marginalized groups (e.g., economically disadvantaged students) in the face of increasing tuition rates, ensuring freedom of expression, eliminating discrimination based on gender and race/ethnicity, preventing sexual harassment, providing adequate assistive technology for students with disabilities, addressing the lack of appropriate role models for students caused by failure to achieve and sustain a diverse faculty, overcoming resistance among students and their parents to diverse perspectives

and experiences, and achieving equity in the classroom (e.g., maintaining fair and reasonable standards for all students).

Goals, desired outcomes, and implementation and assessment strategies were developed for each area of concern, as follows.

GOAL 1: AN ETHICAL INSTITUTION. Strengthen commitment to ethical behavior at the institutional level, thereby providing a model and inspiration for students.

Desired Outcomes:

- The university, at every level, will demonstrate a commitment to high ethical standards.
- Students, faculty, staff, and administrators will adhere to all published institutional policies regarding ethics.

Implementation Strategies:

- 1.1 Create a unified, institution-wide code of ethics – a task that will require participation at every level, from students to Regents.
- 1.2 Develop programs that disseminate and foster understanding, at all institutional levels, of the code of ethics and the responsibility to adhere to it.
- 1.3 Review, discuss, and consider revising current statements of policy on ethics.
- 1.4 Develop a training program for faculty, staff, and administrators to ensure that university policies are implemented in an ethical manner which respects the dignity of each individual, within and outside the university.
- 1.5 Review public pronouncements of the university (e.g. website, marketing materials, Operating Procedures, Regents’ Rules, Strategic Plan) for accuracy, currency, and compliance with ethics policies.

Assessment:

- 1.6 Confirm creation and endorsement of a unified, institution-wide code of ethics.
- 1.7 Determine currency of Operating Procedures (number reviewed and revised in a timely fashion).

- 1.8 Collect statistics on participation in ethics training at all levels of the institution.
- 1.9 Assess participant perceptions of the effectiveness of ethics training.

GOAL 2: ACADEMIC INTEGRITY. Strengthen the campus culture of academic integrity.

Desired Outcomes:

- Students and faculty will demonstrate commitment to the fundamental values of academic integrity.
- The institution will ensure an appropriate and consistent response to academic dishonesty on the part of students and faculty.

Implementation Strategies:

- 2.1 Develop a consistent definition of academic integrity to be displayed prominently on the university web site and in major university publications.
- 2.2 Define clearly the policies and procedures that are to be followed in cases of academic dishonesty.
- 2.3 Emphasize academic integrity and other ethical issues in the “First Year Experience” (e.g., freshman orientation, Red Raider Camp, freshman summer reading program and fall convocation, IS 1100).
- 2.4 Educate students and faculty about internet-enhanced plagiarism and other forms of academic dishonesty.
- 2.5 Address academic integrity issues in all classes, including institutional policies and procedures regarding academic dishonesty.
- 2.6 Provide academic integrity orientation for new faculty.
- 2.7 Provide faculty development in pedagogies that promote academic integrity.
- 2.8 Utilize the resources available through institutional membership in the Center for Academic Integrity more effectively (e.g., faculty development, annual conference, individual faculty memberships, and assessing campus academic integrity climate).
- 2.9 Create a new position, Academic Integrity Officer, to provide support to the academic community on academic integrity issues and oversight of policies and procedures for handling academic misconduct.

- 2.10 Offer professional development for faculty and graduate students on academic integrity in the conduct of research.

Assessment:

- 2.11 Assess effectiveness of new academic integrity policies as they are implemented.
- 2.12 Document the outcomes of reports of academic dishonesty.
- 2.13 Utilize guidelines developed by the Center for Academic Integrity to conduct regular assessments of the campus academic integrity climate.
- 2.14 Track participation in faculty development programs on academic integrity.
- 2.15 Document utilization of Center for Academic Integrity resources.

GOAL 3: ETHICS IN THE CURRICULUM. Raise the level of ethical reasoning employed by students and faculty.

Desired Outcomes:

- The institution will establish and maintain an ethical learning environment.
- Students and faculty will identify and analyze ethical problems.
- Students and faculty will demonstrate higher levels of ethical reasoning.
- Students will have greater access to ethics course.

Implementation Strategies:

- 3.1 Review and consider ways to strengthen ethics instruction in core curriculum/general education requirements.
- 3.2 Perform departmental reviews of ethics instruction in individual disciplines and revise as needed to ensure that ethics is taught effectively.
- 3.3 Provide opportunities for faculty development in the teaching of ethics, such as Teaching, Learning and Technology Center development grants and workshops, support for travel to conferences, and faculty development leaves.
- 3.4 Emphasize ethical reasoning and critical thinking in the teaching of professional codes of conduct, rather than mere memorization of rules and regulations.
- 3.5 Enable students to engage with ethical dilemmas in the "real world" through opportunities for experiential and service learning and interactions with alumni.

- 3.6 Identify and share effective strategies for teaching ethical reasoning and decision-making.
- 3.7 Hire new faculty with expertise in the teaching of ethics.
- 3.8 Involve the Graduate Council, Faculty Senate, and other faculty groups in developing, promoting, and implementing a statement of ethical principles of university teaching.
- 3.9 Encourage and support faculty and graduate student research on ethics

Assessment:

- 3.10 Track increases in ethics course offerings and enrollment.
- 3.11 Assess ethical reasoning at two points in time: prior to core courses in the academic discipline, and upon completion of the core courses.
- 3.12 Document and evaluate instructor data on student performance in analyzing ethical problems and professional conflicts.
- 3.13 Document and evaluate effectiveness of ethics components in experiential and service learning opportunities.
- 3.14 Document and evaluate faculty involvement in conferences, research, and other professional activities that emphasize ethics
- 3.15 Document student and faculty perceptions of the learning environment

GOAL 4: DIVERSITY AND EQUITY. Foster an ethical climate that values diversity in its various forms.

Desired Outcomes:

- Students, faculty, staff, and administration will demonstrate commitment to diversity.
- Students will have opportunities to interact with people from a variety of backgrounds.
- Students will analyze the ethical implications associated with issues of equity and diversity.

- The institution will ensure a welcoming, supportive environment for students, faculty, staff, and administrators of varying backgrounds (e.g., age, culture, disability, ethnicity, gender, political ideology, sexual-orientation, socio-economic status).

Implementation Strategies:

- 4.1 Implement strategies described in the University Strategic Plan for recruiting, retaining, and graduating a more diverse student body.
- 4.2 Expand the definition of diversity in the University Strategic Plan to include developing a campus climate that supports the success of all community members.
- 4.3 Provide professional development and training for faculty, staff and administrators on ways to meet the needs of a diverse student population and Texas Tech community.
- 4.4 Provide professional development for faculty on ways to address issues of diversity within the academic disciplines and pedagogies for teaching diverse populations.
- 4.5 Emphasize involvement of student groups and organizations in a campus-wide diversity awareness campaign.
- 4.6 Provide enhanced learning opportunities for all students by hiring a more diverse faculty, staff, and administrators.
- 4.7 Review and consider ways to strengthen the multicultural requirement in the core curriculum.
- 4.8 Address the concerns identified in the 2003 study conducted by the Diversity Strategic Planning Committee, relative to the perceived campus climate for members of minority groups.
- 4.9 Implement the recommendations for improving the status of women faculty, staff, and students, identified in the 2004 “Report of the Gender Issues Committee.”
- 4.10 Enhance assistive technologies and other support services for students with disabilities.
- 4.11 Identify and involve various alumni groups (e.g., Raiders Rojos, Black Alumni Association) to seek continued recommendations for improving the campus climate for diversity.

Assessment:

- 4.12 Assess Texas Tech community members' commitment to diversity and perceptions of campus climate.
- 4.13 Determine the impact of the implementation of recommendations to improve campus climate for diversity and increase equity for all.
- 4.14 Document faculty participation in professional development activities related to diversity.
- 4.15 Assess progress towards improving the status of women faculty, staff, and students.
- 4.16 Evaluate progress in improving support services for students with disabilities.
- 4.17 Assess the impact of the multicultural requirement in the core curriculum.
- 4.18 Evaluate progress toward development of a campus climate that supports the success of all.
- 4.19 Work with various organizations to develop and refine methods to assess progress toward diversity and equity.

Establishing an Ethics Center

In addition to the specific strategies identified for each of the stated goals, the University will seek funding to institutionalize the QEP initiative by establishing an interdisciplinary ethics center. The center will have as its fundamental aim to enhance the overall ethical culture within the University community and beyond. Ethics centers based at other universities, including those described earlier in this document, will be used as models to design a center that will provide leadership for a wide variety of ethics initiatives, including, but not necessarily limited to, the following:

- Provide leadership for campus-wide ethics programming
- Promote the teaching of ethics, including professional development for faculty
- Support research into both normative ethical theory and applied ethics, including interdisciplinary research

- Arrange for campus visits by nationally renowned scholars in ethics
- Sponsor conferences and symposia focusing on ethical issues within and across disciplines

A draft of a Proposal for an Ethics Center is included in Appendix G.

Leadership

Overall leadership for implementation of the QEP will be provided by the Provost's Office through a QEP Implementation Committee, appointed by the Provost to represent appropriate academic and academic-support units. A member of the faculty will be given release time to serve as Chair of the Implementation Committee.

Leadership for institutional initiatives will be provided by the Board of Regents, Chancellor David Smith, President Jon Whitmore, Provost Bill Marcy, and other members of the central administration. Additional leadership will be provided at the institutional level by faculty interns assigned to the Provost's Office during the summer, and by the Faculty, Staff, and Student Senates.

Academic and academic-support units will choose to be involved in the QEP in ways that meet the needs of the unit, with leadership from academic deans, department chairs, vice presidents and administrators of academic-support units, and individual faculty and staff, as appropriate. Leadership for academic integrity initiatives will be provided by an Academic Integrity Officer, in consultation with the Academic Integrity Task Force, academic unit administrators, and the Office of Student Judicial Programs

The Vice President for Student Affairs and unit administrators in Student Affairs will provide leadership for the implementation of programming and activities that involve student groups and organizations, including new student orientation, Red Raider Camp,

and other “First Year Experience” programs; Greek and residence hall programs; and student publications.

Kathy Stalcup, assessment specialist, and Director of Technology Support in the Advanced Technology Learning Center (ATLC), will provide leadership for comprehensive evaluation.

Additional members of the leadership team will provide leadership for specific QEP implementation and assessment strategies. These include the following groups and individuals:

Dr. David Roach, Chair, and members of the General Education Committee

Dr. Debbie Laverie, Associate Director, Teaching, Learning, and Technology Center

Dr. Dominick Casadonte, Chair, and members of the Teaching Academy Executive Committee

Dr. Gilmour Reeve, Director of Strategic Planning and members of the Strategic Planning Council

Academic Council and department curriculum committees

Murdough Center for Engineering Professionalism and the National Institute for Engineering Ethics

Faculty who teach ethics courses

Resources

A number of existing resources will be utilized to support the QEP. These include, but are not necessarily limited to:

Faculty Development Leaves. Tenured faculty members have the opportunity to apply for a development leaves to pursue research or teaching initiatives. Thirty-six

leaves, either one semester at full salary or two semesters at half salary, are awarded annually.

Competitive grants programs. The Teaching, Learning and Technology Center (TLTC) annually awards ten teaching development grants of up to \$10,000 each. Other competitive grants programs include the biennial multi-disciplinary seed grants program to promote inter/multidisciplinary research, and seed grants programs to support research in individual colleges.

John M. Burns Annual Conference on Teaching. The Teaching Academy sponsors an annual conference on teaching with a noteworthy speaker. The 2005 Conference will feature Dr. Pat Hutchings, Vice President of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, on the topic, “Ethics and the Scholarship of Teaching and Learning.”

Lecture series. The campus hosts a number of lecture series that might incorporate an ethics theme. The Parents Association sponsors the endowed Distinguished Visiting Professorship, which brings a Nobel Laureate or a person of similar stature to campus annually. Other examples include the annual Murdough Symposium hosted by the Murdough Center for Engineering Professionalism, the Helen DeVitt Jones Program Lectures in the College of Education, and the Lokey Lecture Series in the Department of Range and Wildlife.

New resources have been provided to support release time for the Chair of the QEP Implementation Committee, an Academic Integrity Officer, and summer faculty internships. Additional resources will be sought to support other initiatives, including

new endowed lecture series, additional faculty positions, ethics research, and an ethics center.

Evaluation Plan

The comprehensive evaluation plan was designed by Kathy Stalcup, assessment specialist and Director of Technology Support in Information Technology. The plan includes both strategic local assessments targeted toward specific QEP goals and global assessments to evaluate progress toward the ethics initiative as a whole. A variety of assessment tools, including surveys, interviews, and focus groups, will be utilized to collect both quantitative and qualitative data from students, faculty, and other stakeholder groups.

The evaluation plan is designed in four distinct phases that provide for a continuous cycle of data collection, analysis and synthesis of the results, and utilization of assessment data to redirect and strengthen the QEP Implementation Plan. The purpose of ***Phase One*** is to obtain global baseline data through a campus-wide institutional ethics survey. ***Phase Two*** will gather local data relative to specific QEP goals, as outlined in the Implementation Plan.

Phase Three evaluation will involve synthesis of data from global and local assessments to produce annual progress reports for each of the four goals and an annual “State of the Institution Ethics Report.” As the QEP initiative is integrated into the University Strategic Plan, information on ethics-related activities reported by academic and academic-support units in annual Strategic Plan reports will be incorporated into ***Phase Three***.




Phase Four, intervention, will utilize assessment data to modify and strengthen the QEP Implementation Plan, address deficiencies that may be identified, and plan new initiatives, as indicated. It is anticipated that the evaluation cycle will be repeated annually. (See Timeline and Assessment Schedule.)

Timeline and Assessment Schedule

GOAL 1: AN ETHICAL INSTITUTION. Strengthen commitment to ethical behavior at the institutional level, thereby providing a model and inspiration for students.

Desired Outcomes:

- The university, at every level, will demonstrate a commitment to high ethical standards.
- Students, faculty, staff, and administrators will adhere to all published institutional policies regarding ethics.

	2005	2006	2006	2007	2007	2008	2008	2009	2009	2010
	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring
<i>Implementation Strategies:</i>										
1.1 Create unified, institution-wide code of ethics										
1.2 Develop programs to foster responsibility for code of ethics										
1.3 Review/discuss/revise current ethics policies										

	2005	2006	2006	2007	2007	2008	2008	2009	2009	2010	
	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	
1.4 Develop training program to ensure ethical implementation of policies											
1.5 Review public pronouncements for compliance with ethics policies											
Assessment Strategies:											
1.6 Confirm creation of unified code of ethics		X									
1.7 Determine currency of Operating Procedures	X		X		X		X		X		
1.8 Collect statistics on participation in ethics training											
1.9 Assess perceived effectiveness of ethics training											

Timeline and Assessment Schedule

GOAL 2: ACADEMIC INTEGRITY: Strengthen the campus culture of academic integrity.

Desired Outcomes:

- Students and faculty will demonstrate commitment to the fundamental values of academic integrity.
- The institution will ensure a consistent and appropriate response to academic dishonesty on the part of students and faculty.

	2005	2006	2006	2007	2007	2008	2008	2009	2009	2010
	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring
<i>Implementation Strategies:</i>										
2.1 Develop consistent definition of academic integrity		→								
2.2 Define policies and procedures for handling academic dishonesty	→									
2.3 Emphasize academic integrity in programs for incoming freshman									→	
2.4 Educate students and faculty about forms of academic dishonesty									→	

	2005	2006	2006	2007	2007	2008	2008	2009	2009	2010
	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring
2.5 Address academic integrity issues in all classes										
2.6 Provide academic integrity orientation for new faculty										
2.7 Provide faculty development in pedagogies that promote academic integrity										
2.8 Utilize CAI resources more effectively										
2.9 Create new position: Academic Integrity Officer										
2.10 Provide professional development on academic integrity in conducting research										




	2005	2006	2006	2007	2007	2008	2008	2009	2009	2010
	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring
Assessment Strategies:										
2.11 Assess effectiveness of new academic integrity policies		X		X		X		X		X
2.12 Document the outcomes of reported cases of academic dishonesty		X		X		X		X		X
2.13 Utilize CAI guidelines to assess academic integrity climate	X		X		X		X		X	
2.14 Track participation in faculty development programs on academic integrity										
2.15 Document utilization of CAI resources		X		X		X		X		X

Timeline and Assessment Schedule

GOAL 3: ETHICS IN THE CURRICULUM: Raise the level of ethical reasoning employed by students and faculty.

Desired Outcomes:

- The institution will establish and maintain an ethical learning environment.
- Students and faculty will identify and analyze ethical problems.
- Students and faculty will demonstrate higher levels of ethical reasoning.
- Students will have greater access to ethics courses.

	2005	2006	2006	2007	2007	2008	2008	2009	2009	2010
	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring
<i>Implementation Strategies:</i>										
3.1 Review and consider ways to strengthen ethics instruction in core curriculum										
3.2 Perform departmental reviews of ethics instruction in individual disciplines										
3.3 Provide opportunities for faculty professional development in the teaching of ethics										

	2005	2006	2006	2007	2007	2008	2008	2009	2009	2010
	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring
3.4 Emphasize reasoning and critical thinking in teaching professional codes of conduct										
3.5 Enable students to engage in “real world” ethical dilemmas										
3.6 Identify and share effective strategies for teaching ethics										
3.7 Hire new faculty with expertise in ethics										
3.8 Develop, promote, and implement statement of ethical principles of teaching										
3.9 Support ethics research										

	2005	2006	2006	2007	2007	2008	2008	2009	2009	2010
	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring
<i>Assessment Strategies:</i>										
3.10 Track increases in ethics course offerings and enrollment		X		X		X		X		X
3.11 Evaluate ethical reasoning prior to and upon completion of ethics course										
3.12 Document and evaluate instructor data on student performance in analyzing ethical problems										
3.13 Document and evaluate faculty involvement in professional development										
3.14 Document student/faculty perceptions of the learning environment		X		X		X		X		X

Timeline and Assessment Schedule




GOAL 4: DIVERSITY AND EQUITY: Foster an ethical climate that values diversity in its various forms.

Desired Outcomes:

- Students, faculty, staff, and administration will demonstrate commitment to diversity.
- Students will have opportunities to interact with people from a variety of backgrounds.
- Students will analyze the ethical implications associated with issues of diversity.
- The institution will ensure a welcoming, supportive environment for all students, faculty, staff, and administrators of varying backgrounds (for e.g., age, culture, disability, ethnicity, gender, political ideology, sexual-orientation, socio-economic status).

	2005	2006	2006	2007	2007	2008	2008	2009	2009	2010
	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring
Implementation Strategies:										
4.1 Implement diversity strategies in Strategic Plan										
4.2 Expand the Strategic Plan definition of diversity										
4.3 Provide professional development and training on meeting the needs of a diverse population										

	2005	2006	2006	2007	2007	2008	2008	2009	2009	2010
	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring
4.4 Provide faculty professional development for teaching diverse populations										
4.5 Involve student groups and organizations in campus-wide diversity awareness campaign										
4.6 Provide opportunities for enhanced learning by a more diverse faculty and staff										
4.7 Review and consider ways to strengthen the multicultural requirement in the core curriculum										
4.8 Address the concerns identified in the 2003 study relative to perceived campus climate for members of minority groups										
4.9 Implement the recommendations for improving the status of women faculty, staff, students										

	2005	2006	2006	2007	2007	2008	2008	2009	2009	2010
	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring
4.10 Enhance assistive technologies and other support services for students with disabilities										
4.11 Involve various alumni groups to improve campus climate for diversity										
Assessment Strategies:										
4.12 Assess commitment to diversity and perceptions of campus climate		<input type="checkbox" value="X"/>		<input type="checkbox" value="X"/>		<input type="checkbox" value="X"/>		<input type="checkbox" value="X"/>		<input type="checkbox" value="X"/>
4.13 Determine impact of efforts to improve campus climate for diversity and equity				<input type="checkbox" value="X"/>				<input type="checkbox" value="X"/>		
4.14 Document faculty participation in professional development related to diversity										
4.15 Assess progress toward improving the status of women faculty, staff, and students				<input type="checkbox" value="X"/>				<input type="checkbox" value="X"/>		

	2005	2006	2006	2007	2007	2008	2008	2009	2009	2010
	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring
4.16 Evaluate progress in improving support services for students with disabilities		X		X		X		X		X
4.17 Assess the impact of the multicultural requirement in the core curriculum				X				X		
4.18 Evaluate progress toward development of a campus climate that supports the success of all		X		X		X		X		X
4.19 Continue to work with various organizations to assess diversity and equity										

Timeline and Assessment Schedule

	2005	2006	2006	2007	2007	2008	2008	2009	2009	2010
	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring	Fall	Spring
<i>Overall Strategies:</i>										
5.1 Integrate QEP into Strategic Plan	→									
5.2 Establish ethics center					→					
5.3 Execute evaluation plan, Phases One, Two, Three, and Four	→									

References

- A matter of ethics. (2004). East Lansing, MI: Association of College Honor Societies. Retrieved July 9, 2004 from <http://www.achsnaatl.org/ethics/index.asp>.
- Association for Practical and Professional Ethics, Bloomington, IN: Indiana University. Retrieved August 3, 2004 from <http://www.indiana.edu/~appe/program.html>.
- Bok, D. (1982). Moral and ethical education in college: Theoretical and practical considerations. *Beyond the Ivory Tower*. (pp. 116-135). Cambridge, MA: President and Fellows of Harvard College. Reprinted by Josephson Institute on Ethics, Character Counts Development Seminars (2001), pp. 77-82.
- Boss, J.A. (1994). The effect of community service on the moral development of college ethics students. *Journal of Moral Development*, 23(2), 183-198.
- Cannon, B. (2003). Student, staff, and faculty perceptions of campus climate at Texas Tech University. Lubbock, TX: Texas Tech University, Diversity Strategic Planning Committee and StudentFIRST Committee.
- Closing the Gaps: The Texas Higher Education Plan. (2000). Austin: TX: The Texas Higher Education Coordinating Board. Retrieved August 1, 2003 from <http://www.theccb.state.tx.us/AdvisoryCommittees/HEP/0096.htm>.
- Colby, A., Ehrlich, T., Beaumont, E., & Stephens, J. (November/December 2003). Educating undergraduates for responsible citizenship. *Change*, 42-48.
- Davis, G. (2003-2004). Ethics – an educational imperative. *Community College Journal*, 74(3), 6-9.
- De Russy, C. (2003). Professional ethics begin on the college campus. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, 50(4), B20.
- Ethical principles in university teaching. (1996). Vancouver, BC: Society for Teaching and Learning in Higher Education. Retrieved September 6, 2004 from <http://www.mcmaster.ca/stlhe/ethics.html>.
- Ethics of American youth. (2002). Los Angeles: Josephson Institute on Ethics. Retrieved July 26, 2004 from <http://josephsoninstitute.org/Survey2002/survey2002-pressrelease.htm>.
- Faculty commitment to academic integrity. (2003). *Association for Student Judicial Affairs Law and Policy Report*, No. 90. Retrieved July 29, 2004 from <http://www.stanford.edu/dept/vpsa/judicialaffairs/faculty/materials.commitment.htm>

Fleckenstein, M. (1997). Service learning in business ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 16, 1347-52.

Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity (1999). Durham, NC: Duke University/Center for Academic Integrity

Handbook for Reaffirmation of Accreditation (2003). Southern Association of Colleges and Schools/Commission on Colleges.

McCabe, D.L., Trevino, L.K., & Butterfield, K.D. (1996). The influence of collegiate and corporate codes of conduct on ethics-related behavior in the workplace. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 6, 461-476.

McCabe, D.L., Trevino, L.K., & Butterfield, K.D. (2001). Cheating in academic institutions: A decade of research. *Ethics and Behavior*, 11(3), 219-232.

Murdough Center for Engineering Professionalism, Lubbock, TX: Texas Tech University. Retrieved September 15, 2004 from www.murdough.ttu.edu.

Saltmarsh, J. (1997). Ethics, reflection, purpose, and compassion: Community service learning. *New Directions for Student Services*, 77, 81-93.

Report of the Gender Issues Committee (2004). Lubbock, TX: Texas Tech University, Gender Issues Committee.

Texas Tech University Catalog, 2004-2005. Lubbock, TX.

Texas Tech University Ethics Policy (2004). Lubbock, TX: Texas Tech University Operating Policies and Procedures.

Texas Tech University Service Learning Strategic Plan (2003). Lubbock, TX: Texas Tech University. Retrieved September 15, 2004 from <http://www.tlhc.ttu.edu/servicelearning/sites/sl.pdf>.

Texas Tech University Strategic Plan (2003). Lubbock, TX: Texas Tech University. Retrieved August 3, 2004 from <http://www.ttu.edu/stratplan/goals/1.php>

University of Southern California Code of Ethics (2004). Los Angeles: USC. Retrieved September 15, 2004 from http://www.usc.edu/president/code_of_ethics.

Appendices

Appendix A

Members of the QEP Committee

Members of the QEP Committee

Dr. Sue Couch, College of Human Sciences, Committee Chair

Dr. Bryce Conrad, College of Arts and Sciences, Department of English, Graduate School Representative

Dr. Kenneth Davis, Honors College

Dr. Jorge Iber, College of Arts and Sciences, Department of History

Dr. Peggy Johnson, College of Education

Dr. Ralph Viator, Rawls College of Business Administration

Dr. Jonathan Marks, College of Visual and Performing Arts

Dr. Scott Phelan, College of Engineering

Professor Alison Myhra, School of Law

Dr. Michael San Francisco, College of Arts and Sciences, Department of Biological Sciences

Dr. Leslie Thompson, College of Agricultural Sciences and Natural Resources

Professor Gary Smith, College of Architecture

Ex-officio members:

Dr. Gary Elbow, Faculty Representative to the SACS Leadership Team

Dr. Jim Brink, Vice Provost

Appendix B

Survey on Selection of QEP Theme

Survey on Selection of QEP Theme

Texas Tech is preparing for the reaffirmation of accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). One of the requirements of reaffirmation is the development of a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP). SACS describes the QEP as a plan to increase the effectiveness of some aspect of the educational program and improve teaching and learning. If you would like more information about the SACS reaffirmation process, visit the SACS web site at <http://www.irim.ttu.edu/SACS/index.asp>.

The QEP Committee invites input from faculty, staff, students, and others on the selection of a QEP theme. As you complete the survey, keep in mind that the QEP theme must meet the following criteria:

- **Mission.** Is consistent with the mission of Texas Tech University, e.g, improvement of student learning.
- **Quality enhancement.** Has potential to better equip students to function as scholars and citizens within the university community and beyond.
- **Scope.** Reflects the interests of the entire university community, e.g. involves as many academic programs and support units as possible.
- **Support.** Has broad support from faculty, students, administrators, staff, and other stakeholder groups.
- **Pragmatic.** Is feasible in terms of implementation, e.g., consistent with available resources.
- **Accountability.** Outcomes can be measured.

Directions: Please rate each of the following issues using the scale of 1 (low priority for Texas Tech University) to 5 (high priority for Texas Tech University).

1. **Diversity and Access.** Change the composition of the faculty and student body to be more representative of the population from which the University draws.

1 (low priority) 2 3 4 5 (high priority)

Your suggestions for ways to address this issue:

2. **Ethics.** Ensure that every student has the opportunity to develop a code of personal and professional ethics based on such qualities as civility, tolerance, integrity, and citizenship.

1 (low priority) 2 3 4 5 (high priority)

Your suggestions for ways to address this issue:

3. **Experiential learning.** Give students opportunities for relevant and practical learning activities to help them develop cognitive, interpersonal, and creative thinking skills that are valuable in life and work. Examples of experiential learning include cases, internships, and service learning.

1 (low priority) 2 3 4 5 (high priority)

Your suggestions for ways to address this issue:

4. **Graduate and undergraduate instruction.** Ensure the highest quality of teaching and learning in all academic programs.

1 (low priority) 2 3 4 5 (high priority)

Your suggestions for ways to address this issue:

5. **Research.** Advance knowledge and benefit society by increasing the involvement of faculty and students in sponsored and unsponsored research.

1 (low priority) 2 3 4 5 (high priority)

Your suggestions for ways to address this issue:

6. **Undergraduate research.** Provide opportunities for undergraduate students in all disciplines to participate in research activities.

1 (low priority) 2 3 4 5 (high priority)

Your suggestions for ways to address this issue:

Suggest other issues that you think the QEP Committee should consider. For each issue you suggest, include a brief explanation of why you think it is a priority issue and give some suggestions for how it might be addressed.

1.

2.

Indicate your primary relationship to Texas Tech University.

Faculty

Undergraduate Student

Graduate Student/Law Student

Staff

Administrator

Alumni

Other, please specify _____

Thank you for your response.

Appendix C
Ethics Survey

Ethics Survey Questions for Deans, Chairs, and Administrators:

Texas Tech currently is preparing for reaffirmation of accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). One of the requirements for reaffirmation is the development of a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) to improve teaching and learning on our campus. After considering the results of a campus-wide survey conducted during the fall semester and information from a variety of other sources, the QEP Committee recently announced that ethics has been selected as the QEP theme. We need your help. Your responses to the following questions will help us identify ethical issues that are important to the university community and develop a plan to address those issues. ***Please use the NA response for any question that is not relevant for your department or unit.***

1. What important ethical issues face your department/unit?
2. Describe briefly any programs or efforts in your department that address ethical issues.
3. Are there ethical standards ***specific to your profession or discipline*** that are required of faculty, staff, or students? Yes/No/NA

If yes, please describe briefly or attach a copy, if available.

4. Does your department/unit provide training that addresses those requirements for faculty and/or staff? Yes/No/NA

Do degree programs in your department include an ethical component that addresses those requirements for students? Yes/No/NA

5. What are the most important ethical issues facing Texas Tech as an institution?
6. What do you believe should be done to address these issues?
7. In what ways could an increased awareness of ethical issues enhance the academic climate for student learning in your department and/or the university as a whole?

Name:

Title:

Department/Unit:

Ethics Survey Questions for Individual Faculty, Staff, and Students:

Texas Tech currently is preparing for reaffirmation of accreditation by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS). One of the requirements for reaffirmation is the development of a Quality Enhancement Plan (QEP) to improve teaching and learning on our campus. After considering the results of a campus-wide survey conducted during the fall semester and information from a variety of other sources, the QEP Committee recently announced that ethics has been selected as the QEP theme. We need your help. Your responses to the following questions will help us identify ethical issues that are important to the university community and develop a plan to address those issues.

1. What are the most important ethical issues facing Texas Tech?
2. What do you believe should be done to address these issues?
3. In what ways could an increased awareness of ethical issues enhance the academic climate for student learning in your department and/or the university as a whole?

Appendix D

*Report and Recommendations of the Academic Integrity Task Force
Executive Summary*

Report and Recommendations of the Academic Integrity Task Force Executive Summary

The Academic Integrity Task Force convened pursuant to Provost Bill Marcy's appointment and consisted of Kambra Bolch (chair), Rashid Al-Hmoud, Todd Brashears, Jeremy Brown, Greg Elkins, Brandi Grissom, Sindee Simon, and Ben Trotter.

Executive Summary

The Task Force has examined the items with which it was charged and recommends that:

1. The definition of "academic dishonesty" should be modified for the following reasons:
 - a. There are several definitions of academic dishonesty in various university documents, all of which differ to some degree and thus potentially create problems with notice and resolution of allegations.
 - b. The current definition of academic dishonesty as outlined in OP 34.12 is very narrow, and some cases have not been pursued, or were not able to be pursued, because of the narrow definition.
 - c. Faculty are uncertain about whether their efforts to address suspected academic dishonesty through official channels will end up "for naught."
 - d. Students are uncertain about whether certain actions constitute academic dishonesty. Many technological changes, as well as pedagogical changes (e.g., the increased use of work in groups) have occurred in the last decade, and the definition of "academic dishonesty" has not kept pace with these changes.

Specific recommendations regarding changes in the definition are

That the definition of academic dishonesty be made consistent among the variety of documents in which it might appear, and that the definition be publicized prominently;

That the university begin the process to modify its definition of academic dishonesty by consulting several of the excellent definitions of academic dishonesty at other institutions; and

That a general definition of academic dishonesty be included as an element in the revised university definition. The task force specifically recommends that the phrase "any act designed to gain an unfair academic

advantage” be included so that situations not envisioned at the writing of the policy can be addressed.

2. The procedures that are to be followed when academic dishonesty is suspected by a faculty member should be more clearly defined for the following reasons:
 - a. Faculty members do not always follow the procedures (sometimes because of lack of awareness, sometimes because of confusion, and sometimes for other reasons), and this leaves them potentially vulnerable; while relatively few cases of alleged academic dishonesty end in court, it is important for faculty to follow the stated procedures so that legal counsel can be effected through the attorney general’s office. In addition to leaving faculty vulnerable, failure to follow procedures may send unintended messages to students, including the message that academic dishonesty is not taken seriously.
 - b. Students are placed in a difficult situation if they are not granted a clearly defined process, which includes the basic elements of notice and an opportunity to be heard. Students should be afforded a just and appropriate process to ensure that the alleged actions indeed constitute academic dishonesty.
 - c. The university is placed in a potentially vulnerable legal situation if basic due process is not granted to students suspected of academic dishonesty.

The task force specifically recommends

That the procedures employed by the University of Texas at Austin be used as a template for the revision of TTU’s procedures, as it provides a model that allows faculty members to retain primary authority for handling suspected academic dishonesty matters, it is clear and concise, as well as sufficiently broad, in its language to enable both students and faculty to understand the policy, and it is well orchestrated in its efforts to provide eight critical elements (guidance and support for faculty, clear procedural protections for students, a more certain mechanism for catching repeated academic dishonesty, a clear burden of proof, an appropriate level for the burden of proof, appropriately non-legal language, and appeal rights that conform to court decisions). The task force’s specific recommendations regarding each of these eight items are detailed in the full report.

The task force also makes the following additional recommendations:

Since the needs of the School of Law differ dramatically from those of the institution at large as seen by their unique policies currently in place, the task force recommends that the School of Law continue to promulgate its own policies as appropriate to that particular enterprise.

The university should provide an academic integrity orientation for all new students during their first semester at the university.

The university should provide an academic integrity orientation, including information about resources for faculty, for all new faculty during their first semester at the university.

The university should provide additional resources to faculty regarding prevention of academic dishonesty. (See pp. 12-16, "Issues and Perspectives on Academic Integrity" in Appendix A.)

The university should develop a brochure regarding the faculty's role in suspected academic dishonesty matters. (See Appendix B for a sample brochure.)

Information about the university's academic integrity policy, and information about all resources available to faculty, staff, and students, should be prominently displayed and easily available on the university's website.

The university should consider using the resources available through the Center for Academic Integrity to mobilize the faculty regarding this issue. (See Appendix C for the Center's document The Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity.)

The university should ensure that the Teaching Academy and the Teaching-Learning Technology Center be included in the development of resources for faculty.

The university should take more deliberate action to stall the actions of unscrupulous "tutoring" centers which foster actions detrimental to integrity, such as unauthorized removal of exams by students. Since these centers may trespass or post items in violation of university policies, the task force recommends that these avenues be explored as the bases upon which their activities may be curtailed. Furthermore, the task force recommends that the academic orientation students receive upon arrival at the university include information about prohibited actions so that students would be aware whether their actions in aiding such a center would be violations of the university's academic dishonesty policy.

Because the time available to this task force was limited and the recommendations are comprehensive, the task force recommends that the

university appoint an additional committee or task force to develop a new definition of academic dishonesty and the procedures for handling suspected cases of academic dishonesty.

If the university follows these recommendations, the following should be accomplished:

1. Students will be placed “on notice” regarding what acts constitute academic dishonesty. If the definition of academic dishonesty is broadened, students will know more readily what actions are to be avoided. This should strengthen the university’s culture of academic integrity and should allow students to avoid situations which may be “gray” under the current policies.
2. Faculty will feel more secure about pursuing suspected cases of academic dishonesty since more clarity will exist. As faculty are able to see appropriate outcomes for cases of academic dishonesty, their confidence in the process should be increased. And, as more cases are pursued to resolution with an appropriate penalty, the university’s culture of academic integrity should be strengthened.
3. Clarity in the policy should yield more consistent outcomes—that is, similarly situated students should be treated in similar ways. This should enhance the perception of fairness, which should also strengthen the university’s culture of academic integrity.
4. Any liability the university has at present should be lessened. Students afforded a just and appropriate process have less impetus to sue, and, even if suit is brought following the outcome of such a process, the university should prevail.

Appendix E

*Student, Staff, and Faculty Perceptions of Campus Climate at
Texas Tech University, Executive Summary*

Student, Staff, and Faculty Perceptions of Campus Climate at Texas Tech University, Executive Summary

During Spring 2003, survey data were collected from students, staff, and faculty on the Lubbock campuses of Texas Tech and the Health Sciences Center. The content of the surveys was unique to each population, but all centered on the overarching concept of campus climate, with particular emphasis on racial climate. While the overall results of each survey suggest a relatively high level of satisfaction with the campus climate, several notable findings emerged.

Student survey key findings

- Students overall rate the campus climate in positive terms as well as their global evaluation of faculty.
- Students identifying themselves as Black or Other/Multi-racial report participating in campus organizations at a statistically significantly higher rate than students from other racial/ethnic groups.
- White and Hispanic students perceive the University as more supportive than Black, Asian, and Other/Multi-racial students.
- Students identifying themselves as Other/Multi-racial report higher levels of personal interactions with students and faculty than students from the other racial/ethnic categories.
- In a global evaluation of campus climate, White students give the highest rating, followed by Asian, Hispanic, Other/Multi-racial, and Black students, respectively. However, all groups give positive ratings to the University.
- Nearly one in four (22.3%) Black students felt the campus was not a welcoming community upon their arrival, compared to fewer than one in twenty (3.7%) White students. Similar results emerge when the question refers to Lubbock as opposed to the campus.
- While over ninety percent of White, Hispanic, and Asian students indicate they would recommend the University to a friend, the same is true of fewer than eighty percent of Black and Other/Multi-racial students.

Staff survey key findings

- Staff overall rate the general atmosphere of the University in positive terms and express a relatively high level of job satisfaction.
- White staff members report experiencing prejudicial remarks, either as a witness or victim, at statistically significantly lower levels than staff identifying themselves as Black, Hispanic, or Other.
- While staff as a whole rate their department in positive terms, Hispanic staff provide lower ratings than staff of other racial/ethnic groups.
- The staff are in general agreement with regard to their perception of the campus climate, with few differences across racial/ethnic groups.

Faculty survey key findings

- Non-White faculty report exposure to prejudicial remarks at statistically significantly higher levels than White faculty, with the largest gap between the two groups related to experiencing such remarks based on national origin.
- Non-White faculty are less inclined to believe their department has made serious efforts to hire racial/ethnic minority faculty compared to White faculty.
- Non-White faculty and female faculty are less inclined to believe their department has made serious efforts to hire female faculty compared to White and male faculty.
- Non-White faculty and female faculty are less inclined to believe faculty are treated equally regardless of race/ethnicity at the departmental level compared to White and male faculty.
- Female faculty are less inclined to believe faculty are treated equally regardless of gender at the departmental level compared to male faculty.
- Non-White faculty are more likely to believe the tenure process at TTU/TTUHSC is unfair compared to White faculty.
- Non-White faculty are less likely to indicate they have received adequate guidance or mentoring from colleagues compared to White faculty.

Source: Cannon, B. (2003). Student, staff, and faculty perceptions of campus climate at Texas Tech University. Lubbock, TX: Texas Tech University, Diversity Strategic Planning Committee and StudentFIRST Committee.

Appendix F

University-based Ethics Centers

University-based Ethics Centers

Center for Ethics and Social Justice, Loyola of Chicago (<http://www.luc.edu/depts/ethics>)

Center for the Study of Ethics in the Professions at the Illinois Institute of Technology
(<http://www.iit.edu/departments/csep>)

Institute for Applied and Professional Ethics at Ohio University
(<http://www.ohiou.edu/ethics/welcome.html>)

Kenan Institute on Ethics at Duke University (<http://kenan.ethics.duke.edu>)

Lincoln Center for Applied Ethics at Arizona State University
(<http://www.asu.edu/clas/lincolncenter>)

Center for Applied Ethics at Santa Clara University (<http://www.scu.edu/ethics>)

Program on Ethics and Public Life at Cornell University (<http://www.arts.cornell.edu/epl>)

Robert J. Rutland Center for Ethics at Clemson University
(<http://www.clemson.edu/caah/rutland/index.html>)

Appendix G

Proposal for an Ethics Center

To be added.