

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.