**KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY HONOR & INTEGRITY SYSTEM**

**Annual Report**

***Education, Consultation, Mediation, Adjudication:***

***We do it all with student development in mind.\****

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

**Article VI of the *Constitution* requires the Honor System Director to provide an annual report to Student Senate, Faculty Senate and the Provost annually. This report summarizes the activities of the Honor System for the 2006/2007 academic year.**

The primary purpose of the Honor & Integrity System is to promote academic integrity as a standard of expectation within the university community. With this purpose in mind, the Honor & Integrity System has sought to promote academic integrity through both education and adjudication. This report will emphasizes both of those missions as well as provide an abbreviated report of the system changes occurring during the reporting period.

**ADJUDICATION:**

The Honor & Integrity System has processed 116 Honor Pledge Violation reports during the reporting period. The following graph represents the number of cases handled by the Honor & Integrity System since its inception in 1999. In 2006-2007 the number of reports received by the office decreased for the first time. Although this is not necessarily a significant decrease in reported cases it does appear over the past three years the system has experienced a plateau effect. The staff in the Honor System office did consult on eight additional cases for which official Honor Pledge Violation reports were not filed.



Honor System Violation reports were received from all levels of teaching faculty at the university. Tenure track faculty constituted 63% of the violation reports while Instructors reported 20% of the violations. Graduate Teaching Assistants filed 12% of the reports and the remaining 5% were reported through the Division of Continuing Education.



For the 2006-2007 academic year 150 students were reported to the Honor & Integrity System. Of these 127 students were sanctioned for violations. Note that some students were reported for more than one violation. The remaining 23 students were involved in cases that were either dismissed for insufficient information or were found not responsible by a hearing panel. The chart below identifies the breakdown of student classification.



Of the 127 students sanctioned, four students had previous Honor Pledge violations and two had previously taken the Development and Integrity course. The Honor Council conducted 24 investigations. During the investigations phase four cases were closed by the Director based upon the recommendation of the Case Investigators. In two of these cases definitive information existed to determine the student was responsible for the violation and in two cases there was insufficient information to support an Honor Pledge violation. A student involved in one of these cases was later reported a second time during the same semester. The available information was strongly weighted against the students and while the student did not admit to the violation the student chose not to contest the violation report.

**5%**

The Honor Council conducted 18 hearings during the reporting period. Six hearings involved students who were accused of a second violation. Five of these students did not contest the second violation while one student did contest the violation report. A second uncontested violation report automatically requires a hearing to consider if additional sanctions should be imposed by the Honor Council. All students involved in a second violation report were found responsible by the Hearing Panel however no additional sanctions were assigned following these decisions. Each panel found the initial sanction assigned by the reporter to be sufficient for each violation.

Nine investigations and subsequent hearings were initiated based upon the students desire to contest the violation reports. Seven investigations and hearings were initiated by faculty members who chose to file the reports under “Option 2”. This option requires the Honor Council to investigate the potential violation.

In three of the hearings resulting from contested violation reports hearing panels found the students not responsible for a violation. The first case involved two students who were alleged to have engaged in unauthorized collaboration on a homework assignment. One of the students did not contest the violation while the other student did contest. The student who did not contest had evidently copied the work of the student who did contest without that student’s knowledge. The Hearing Panel found that no information existed to indicate the student knew the paper was copied and therefore found that the student was not responsible for the actions of the other student.

The second case involved a student who was alleged to have plagiarized while completing a library survey assignment. The student was involved in a library scavenger hunt but failed to cite the sources of her responses to the questions. The Hearing Panel found that the student did not submit the material with the intent of claiming the work as her own. This determination was based upon the nature of the assignment. Each question required a specific piece of information from exactly one source. Since the information was obtained from a single source and no other source could have provided the information it was determined that the student did not intentionally plagiarize the material or claim the information as her own. Therefore the Hearing Panel found the student was not responsible for plagiarism.

The third hearing involved two graduate students who were alleged to have collaborated on an on-line quiz. There appeared to be consistency between their responses to the multiple choice questions contained on the quiz. The students presented a lengthy defense for the similarities in their responses. The Hearing Panel, after a lengthy deliberation, found the students explanation plausible and ruled that sufficient information did not exist to hold them responsible. It should be noted here that one of these students had a second violation report filed during the spring semester that alleged he purchased a paper on-line and submitted it for a grade. The student was later found responsible for the violation and the Honor Council recommended to the Provost that he be suspended for a period of three years. The Provost acted upon this recommendation and the student is currently serving the suspension.

As with past years the largest form of Honor Pledge Violations involved plagiarism (66 cases). Most of these incidents were directly linked to internet sources. However, a few cases were linked to previously used papers or projects. The second largest form of academic dishonesty involves engaging in unauthorized collaboration (43 cases) on tests, quizzes, or projects. Seven cases were filed involving falsification or forgery.

One particularly interesting case involved a situation where a student was appealing a ruling by a Hearing Panel. The student falsified an email message that essentially contained information that, if authentic, exonerated him from responsibility for the violation. While investigating the origin of the email message the Director discovered the student had fraudulently created the document. This result was discovered based upon a forensics review of a lap top computer upon which the original email was sent. The Director denied the appeal and filed a code of conduct violation with the SGA Attorney General as per SGA By-Laws Article VI, Sections 3 and 6. Prior to the violation report the student was found responsible for a second violation and the hearing panel recommended that he be suspended from the university. In addition, the Student Judicial Board also found the student responsible for his actions and recommended a permanent separation from the university. The Provost and President acted upon this recommendation and the student is no longer associated with the university.

During the reporting period the Honor System received five Honor Pledge Violation reports from the Division of Continuing Education. Four of these reports were against the same student. This student submitted fraudulent proctoring information for four classes in which she was enrolled. The student admitted to the falsification and a Hearing Panel recommended that she be suspended from the university. She is currently serving her suspension. The other case involved a student who is alleged to have falsified proctoring information as well. The student has elected to contest the violation and the investigation is on-going.

An examination of the sanctions assigned by either Reporters or Hearing Panels indicates that most students received multiple sanctions. During the reporting period 27 XFs were assigned by faculty members. In addition, 70 students were required to enroll in the Development and Integrity course. A grade of zero was assigned to 47 students and 33 students received reduced grades on assignments. Twenty-four warnings were given and community service was assigned to two students. Hearing panels recommend suspension for three students. The Provost accepted these recommendations and those students are currently serving their suspensions.

At the time of this report the Honor Council is engaged in three investigations from the reporting period. In addition, we are awaiting final reports from two additional cases involving violations that occurred during the summer. This will bring the total number of cases submitted to my office to 118 for the reporting period. The numbers associated with these cases have not been included in the previous data as there is no clear indication of the outcome of the cases.

**EDUCATION:**

A primary goal of the Honor & Integrity System is to promote academic integrity through education. This education extends not only to students but to faculty as well. Dr. Helene Marcoux, Associate Director, is charged with the task of contacting teaching faculty, visiting classrooms, student groups, and organizational meetings. She is also responsible for providing professional development for Honor Council members.

In addition to the above-mentioned tasks, Dr. Marcoux is responsible for conducting all case reviews with Alleged Violators. During the reporting period she has conducted 115 case reviews. The time commitment needed to address this many reviews is compounded when considering the volume of email and telephone contacts needed to establish lines of communication and schedule case reviews. Case reviews take approximately 20 minutes.

The Honor and Integrity Peer Educators (HIPE) organization has continued to be a critical component to the educational process. HIPE members conducted 56 presentations to both undergraduate and graduate students, GTAs and faculty. Dr. Marcoux, working with the HIPE organization, has established contact with new faculty members and together they have presented in many of those faculty members’ classrooms. Although the exact number of students who have heard Honor System presentations is unknown, an appropriate estimate for the reporting period is in excess of 4,000. In addition we have records of presentations to 120 Graduate Teaching Assistants, and over 28 individual faculty members or departments. The educational role is extended to the Salina campus where on several occasions Dr. Marcoux and the HIPE members travel to Salina for presentations and professional development for Honor Council members serving on the campus.

Since faculty members comprise the more stable population at the university, Dr. Marcoux’s focus for the 2007/2008 term is faculty professional development with regard to the Honor & Integrity System’s philosophy and procedures. Two initiatives include 1) targeted and scheduled departmental meetings across campus, and 2) a series of five faculty “brown bag” mini-workshops focused upon defining and addressing academic integrity in the classroom.

The Associate Director is initiating a more long-range project for student awareness. The design and development of a pilot project with Distance Education personnel will entail an interactive tutorial on scholarly writing and research, with an emphasis on the importance of integrity in both endeavors. The end product will incorporate a gating component to second-semester enrollment. Campus-wide input will be key to the acceptance of such a tutorial; therefore initial work on the tutorial will include networking with Distance Education administration, Hale library personnel, the English department, and Institutional Review Board representatives.

The Development & Integrity Course is an educational sanction taught by the Associate Director through the College of Education. During the reporting timeframe, eight separate sections were offered to accommodate the 62 students assigned by faculty and 8 students assigned by hearing panels to successfully complete the course. Twenty-six students assigned in previous terms completed the course, as well as 43 students assigned during the term of reporting. Thirty-four students from the reporting term and 11 students from previous terms have not yet taken the assigned course.

**ADMINISTRATIVE:**

The 2006-2007 academic year saw the culmination of a two year effort to finalize the review and implementation of the revised Investigation and Adjudication Procedures as well as the changes to the Constitution. The final changes to the Constitution were approved in June by Faculty Senate and have been presented to Student Senate for approval. I would like to thank both the Faculty and Student Senate for their support during this laborious process.

The Honor & Integrity System has successfully implemented the changes to the name of the system noted in last years report. During the spring semester we held a competition in an advanced graphics design class to design new posters, brochures, and bookmarks displaying the new name. The winning student designed a poster emphasizing a system built upon trust between faculty and students that can be seen displayed throughout campus.

During the last reporting period SGA approved a one-year funding request by the Honor & Integrity System to support a half-time administrative assistant position in our office. Previously the office was maintained by a half-time administrative assistant and the Associate Director assumed the clerical responsibilities during the time when the Administrative Assistant was not present. Since the allocation of the funding from SGA I have been able to secure, from the Provost office, a permanent budget to support a full time Administrative Assistant. I greatly appreciate SGA’s support during a time when the system did not have the funding to support this position. At this time the system has more personnel resources that at any time during the past seven years. Based upon the number of consultations and the time committed to investigation and hearings this funding should fulfill our current personnel needs in the office and allow the Associate Director to attend to the demands associated with educating the campus community.

David S. Allen

Honor & Integrity System Director

September 2007