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ORDER OF BUSINESS:
I. Call of the Meeting to Order
II. Informal Statements and Proposals
III. Approval of the Minutes
IV. President’s Report
V. Committee Reports
VI. Old Business
   A. Policy on Student Misconduct and Academic Integrity
      Executive Committee & Select Sub Committee (salmon attachment)
   B. Discussion on how to display the Dismissal for Cause Policy on the
      Handbook for Faculty website (grey attachment)
VII. New Business
VIII. As May Arise
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Eimer Hoyer         President       6314       Box 44
JoLynne Campbell   Vice President   5653       Box 43
Nan Myers           Secretary       5138       Box 68
A. J. Mandt          President Elect 3375       Box 102
William Terrell     Past President  3220       Box 78

ELECTED BY THE SENATE
Deborah Baxter      3103       Box 53
Dwight Murphrey     3219       Box 77

APPOINTED BY THE PRESIDENT
Barbara Hodson      3240       Box 75
5.07/ POLICY ON STUDENT MISCONDUCT AND ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

A. Policy Statement

The Faculty, Staff, and Administration of Wichita State University will not condone or tolerate academic misconduct, including breaches of academic integrity. The policy of the Kansas Board of Regents, as adopted in June of 1994, is as follows:

The Board of Regents believes that student academic dishonesty is inimical to the fundamental ideals of public higher education. Furthermore, the Board believes that public higher education has a mission to develop the moral reasoning abilities of students and to promote the importance of integrity in all aspects of student life, but particularly in academics. Therefore, it is the policy of the Kansas Board of Regents that student academic dishonesty should not be tolerated on the campuses of the Regents institutions.

Each Regents university shall implement and promote specific policies, procedures, and programs which seek to: (i) identify prohibited academic conduct by students; (ii) educate all students, faculty and administrators with regard to the nature, impact and consequences of student academic dishonesty; (iii) effectively report and seek to reduce such behaviors; (iv) provide for due process for students accused of academic dishonesty; (v) set forth clear sanctions, ranging from reprimand to dismissal from the university, for students who are determined to have committed dishonest acts; and (vi) implement a comprehensive and integrated plan to promote academic integrity among students, faculty and administrators.

B. Definitions

The terms faculty member or faculty as used in this Policy Statement shall include not only persons of professorial rank (full, associate or assistant), but also instructors, adjuncts, GTA's, unclassified professionals and administrators who teach, and lecturers.

A student is a person enrolled in any class at the University on any campus and at any time pertinent to conduct by the individual covered by this Policy Statement.

Academic misconduct, which includes academic dishonesty, is behavior in which a deliberate means is employed to gain undeserved intellectual credit or advantage, either for oneself or another, or which is disruptive of a course of study or abusive toward members of the university community. Some examples of academic misconduct are:

1. Plagiarism. Plagiarism is intentionally using the printed/published data, distinctive ideas or language of someone else without specifically acknowledging the original source; e.g., copying another student's paper, creative work, article, or computer work and submitting it as part of an assignment. On the other hand, the use of "common knowledge" or of ideas that are not distinctive to a single source does not require acknowledgment. Subject to the foregoing, the particular circumstances under which acknowledgment is required may vary among the different disciplines which make up the University; in addition, the manner or style used to acknowledge a source will vary among disciplines. In a particular course, students must follow the plagiarism customs and standards of the discipline offering the course and acknowledge sources in the manner expected by that
discipline. The respective college's Academic Conduct Committee is charged with articulating such customs and standards, if any, and the instructor in any given course is responsible for making these standards clear.

2. Unauthorized Collaboration on Out-of-Class Projects. Students may not present work as individual when, in fact, the work was done with other students.

3. Cheating on Exams. Cheating on exams is defined as the unauthorized use of information gained from other students and staff and/or with the assistance of notes, textbooks, etc. It is the responsibility of each instructor to inform students which information aids, if any, may be used on exams.

4. Unauthorized Access to Exams in Advance of the Examination. Students who in any unauthorized manner obtain exams in advance of the date and hour of the examination are committing an act of academic dishonesty. Unauthorized access to an exam does not include obtaining copies of exams given in previous semesters and returned to students, but it does include a sharing of information about an unreturned exam between a student in an earlier section of a class and a student in a later section.

5. Fraudulent Alterations of Academic Materials. A student who alters documents or other information (such as grade reports, course withdrawal slips, or research data) to provide undeserved credit or advantage has committed an act of academic dishonesty.

6. Aiding and/or Abetting an Academically Dishonest Undertaking. A student is responsible for ensuring that his/her work is not misused by other students. Students are required to protect the integrity of their own work by, for example, not allowing, knowingly or through carelessness, another student to plagiarize a term paper or copy answers to an exam.

7. Sabotage of Student/Faculty/University Work or Property. Sabotage is any act by a student which intentionally or recklessly damages and/or destroys others' work. For example, students who destroy computer programs written by other persons are committing acts of sabotage. Students who steal, destroy or mutilate library materials also commit sabotage.

8. Bribery, Blackmailing, or Intimidating; Attempts. Academic misconduct is present in gaining an unfair advantage over other students by giving money or gifts to other students, faculty, staff, etc.; by threatening in any way other students, faculty, staff, etc. with exposure of a personal or professional incident; by threatening other students, faculty, staff, etc. with bodily or other types of harm; or in any attempt to do any of these things.

C. Responsibilities for Academic Integrity

The fundamental responsibility for the maintenance of the standards of honesty rests upon the student. It is each student's responsibility to be familiar with University policy on academic honesty and to uphold standards of academic honesty at all times in all situations.

Faculty members are responsible for clarification to their classes of those standards of honesty for class assignments or projects where such standards may be unclear or when such standards vary from the accepted norm; each faculty member shall also make clear to each class early in the semester the faculty member's own policy toward penalties he or she gives for breaches in academic integrity. In addition, it is anticipated that faculty members will be the persons who will discover most instances of academic misconduct; accordingly, faculty need to be aware of the possibility that academic misconduct might occur, watchful for any instances of misconduct, and diligent in addressing those who act dishonestly.

5.071/Court of Academic Appeals Committee

The Court of Academic Appeals was established in 1967 by vote of the University faculty to assure academic due process for students who feel they have been treated unfairly in the classroom. The court's
jurisdiction includes any disputes between students and faculty that cannot be settled within the framework of the student-faculty relationship, including unfairness in grading or in an instructor's charges of plagiarism, cheating, and similar offenses. The Court of Student Academic Appeals is composed of three tenured faculty members and two student members. Decisions of the court are final and carry the power to change a grade. The Court of Academic Appeals should report the number of cases it handles each year to the Vice President of Academic Affairs and to the Faculty Senate in its annual report.

5.072/Procedures for Academic Appeals

1. Students should make every effort to resolve problems with the instructor before filing an appeal. A student must file an appeal within one semester after the grade is assigned (excluding summer). (The Court reserves the right, in exceptional circumstances, to suspend this rule.)

2. If this effort does not resolve the problem for the student, the student may go directly to the chair of the department of the faculty member, or:

3. If there is no resolution at this step, the student has the option of:
   a. Discussing the problem with the Dean of the College of the faculty member if they have gone to the chair of the department of the faculty member; or:
   b. Picking up an appeal form in the office of the Dean of Students. The student should meet with the Dean of Students or Designee to determine:
      1. Whether opportunities for resolving the problem with the faculty member have been exhausted, and
      2. Whether the problem is resolvable through existing University procedures other than the Court.

4. The Dean of Students or Designee may indicate that a case is inappropriate, but students maintain their right to appeal if they wish to do so.

5. The student may make an appointment with the Student Ombudsperson, Rhatigan Student Center, for assistance in:
   a. Resolving the case, and/or
   b. Preparing the appeal

6. The completed appeal is returned by the student to the office of the Dean of Students for distribution along with a copy of the Procedures of the Court to the (a) faculty member, (b) department chair of the faculty member, and (c) the Dean of the College of the faculty member.

7. The faculty member named in the appeal will submit a written statement on the case to his/her department chair. After reviewing the case, the department chair should form a judgment and/or attempt to resolve the issue without exerting pressure on either the faculty member or the student. The department chair should indicate on the form: (a) a recommendation to sustain the faculty member's decision, (b) recommendation that the appeal be sustained, (c) a statement that the issue cannot be resolved at this level. (Space is provided on the form for these comments)

8. After the department chair has made a recommendation, the case is referred to the Dean of the College of the faculty member. After reading the appeal and the recommendation of the department chair, the Dean should clarify issues by discussing the matter with the student and the faculty member. The Dean should indicate a recommended action and return the appeal form to the Office of the Dean of Students who will submit it to the chair of the Court.

2. The student should pick up an appeal form in the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students, 103 Grace Wilkie Hall. The complainant should meet with the Vice President for Student Affairs to determine: (a) whether opportunities for resolving the problem with the instructor have been exhausted, and (b) whether the problem is resolvable through existing University procedures other than the Court:
The Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students may indicate that a case is inappropriate; but students maintain their right to appeal if they wish to do so:

3. The student should make an appointment with the student Ombudsperson, 201 Campus Activities Center, for assistance in: (a) resolving the case, and/or (b) preparing the appeal.

4. The completed appeal is returned by the student to the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students for distribution along with a copy of the Procedures of the Court to the faculty member named in the appeal, and to the department chair and dean. This will be the instructor's dean, not the student's, though they may in some cases, be the same.

5. The faculty member named in the appeal will submit a written statement on the case to the department chair. After reviewing the case, the department chair should form a judgment and/or attempt to resolve the issue without exerting pressure on either the instructor or the student.

---

6. After the department chair has made a recommendation, the case is referred to the appropriate academic dean. After reading the appeal and the recommendation of the department chair, the dean may clarify issues by discussing the matter with the student and instructor.

The dean should indicate a recommended action and return the appeal form to the Vice President for Student Affairs and Dean of Students, who will submit it to the chair of the Court.

9. The chair of the Court will, after receiving the case, inform the student and the instructor in writing of its receipt and request from each a written statement and any additional information the Court might need. This information must be received by the Court within two weeks. The instructor and the student may visit with the Court chair or write to the Court about questions of procedure.

10. The instructor and student will be notified in writing no less than seven days in advance of the projected date of the hearing along with information pertaining to the exact time and place of the hearing. The Court should establish the time for a hearing only after both the student and faculty member have been contacted and have indicated they can attend the hearing at that time. If the faculty member is not on campus during the semester of the hearing, only the student need be called prior to the establishment of the time of the hearing.

11. These procedures will be followed in an actual hearing:

   a. All hearings are closed.
   b. Members of the Court will be faculty and students who have no connection with either party involved in the appeal.
   c. Hearings will be kept as informal as possible. A taped transcript of the hearing but not the deliberations will be made. These tapes will be maintained for one year. The tapes and all written material will be treated as confidential information.
   d. The instructor and student are expected to appear at the hearing. If the student does not appear for the hearing, the case will not be heard. If the faculty member does not wish to appear, the case will be heard.
   e. The student and faculty member may be represented by counsel from the University community but not by an attorney.
   f. Either party may ask members of the University community (students, faculty, staff) to present testimony relevant to the case.
   g. The instructor and the student will have access to the written statements of each other at least seven days prior to the hearing. These statements will be treated as confidential material.
   h. Relevant class records are to be made available to the Court upon request.
   i. After opening statements by both parties, each will have the opportunity to question the
other during the hearing, subject to academic decorum.
j. Members of the Court may question both parties to the dispute as well as those persons
presenting testimony in the case.
k. When questioning is finished, both parties, counsel and witnesses, if any, will be excused.
l. Decisions of the Court are based on a majority vote.
m. For conducting business, a quorum consists of four members of the Court.

12. The decision and the rationale for the decision are reported in writing to each party and to the
officials who reviewed the appeal by the chair of the hearing. Majority and minority opinions may be
included. If the Court has suggestions for improving or eliminating the conditions which led to the case,
these should be detailed in a separate letter to the faculty member with copies to his/her department chair
and dean.

13. If the decision calls for a change of grade, the Office of the Registrar will be so advised; the chair of
the Court will authorize the registrar to make the official change. Decisions affecting other offices will
result in similar correspondence with those offices.

14. The Court does not rehear cases.  

(Current as of November, 1998 / March 11, 1985.)
MEMORANDUM

TO: Elmer A. Hoyer

FROM: Ted D. Ayres

RE: Dismissal For Cause Policy

DATE: Friday, October 30, 1998

On Friday, August 14, 1998, President Hughes sent you a memorandum relating to the above-noted policy. I am advised that you did not follow-up on his invitation to meet to further discuss the matter.

It appears that we are in a situation where we must, in good faith, agree to disagree. However, with the approval and recommendation of the Executive Council, President Hughes has determined that the University policy should be revised and/or clarified to avoid misunderstandings and to put same in full compliance with state law and Regents policy regarding the authority of the President. Please be advised that, effective November 1, 1998, Section 4.23 of the WSU Policies & Procedures Manual will be modified/expanded to read as follows:

If mutual consent is not reached on the matter at this point, a committee appointed by the President of the Faculty Senate will be charged with the function of informally inquiring into the situation to effect an adjustment if possible, and, if not effected, to determine whether in its view formal proceedings to consider dismissal of the faculty member should be instituted.

If the Informal Review Committee makes a preliminary finding that the charges, if substantiated, might be sufficient in its opinion to warrant dismissal, it will recommend that the matter proceed to a formal hearing. The Vice President for Academic Affairs will prepare a complaint based on the charges for which the Informal Review Committee believes there is evidence. It is the expectation of these procedures that the matter will proceed based upon the specific charges recommended by the Informal Review Committee, provided, however, that the University will have the authority to initiate a complaint even though not recommended by the Informal Review Committee. It is upon the specific charges contained in the complaint, as it may come to be amended, that the matter will proceed.
Any additional charges must be discussed with the Informal Review Committee if they are to be heard in formal hearings.

If a complaint is initiated, it should be commenced by a communication addressed to the faculty member informing him/her of the Informal Committee's findings, and informing him. . . .

Remainder of Section will be unchanged.

I would request the cooperation of the Faculty Senate in updating Section 3.29 of the Faculty Handbook (94-95 Revision) to make it consistent with University policy. As you know, revisions to the Procedures for Dismissal for Cause have been under discussion since 1993. In the latter part of 1996 and early 1997, discussions between Jolynne Campbell, Donna Hawley, Peter Zoller and me were very positive and successful, including reaching agreement on the above-noted concepts vis-a-vis the Faculty Handbook. Unfortunately, while we have subsequently been unable to bring those discussions to fruitful closure and finally concur as to the language, I do think the debate was healthy and illuminating; in that regard, I hope that you agree it was worthwhile.

Please advise should you have any questions or comments about this memorandum.

cc: Eugene M. Hughes
Members, President's Executive Council
Donald L. Beggs
Jolynne Campbell
Chris Cavanaugh
Donna Hawley
Peter Zoller
Comments on the Executive Committee’s document on Academic Integrity
From: Kirk Lancaster

The University Curriculum Committee was asked to prepare a document on Academic Integrity in the Fall of 1995. The current (1998-9) Faculty Senate has not seen a copy of the original document. One criticism of a modified document which the Faculty Senate considered recently was excellent. It should have (but was not) clear that each faculty member should determine whether cheating had or had not occurred in her/his course. The document was intended to allow the faculty of each college to determine its own policy with regard to academic integrity. It was intended to attempt to meet the charge from the Board of Regents.

The document to be considered today does not seem to me to meet the charge from the Board. In particular, it seems primarily to be concerned with the appeal process of students charged with academic misconduct. In the charge to the Faculty Senate is included:

"(v) set forth clear sanctions, ranging from reprimand to dismissal from the university, for students who are determined to have committed dishonest acts;"

in my opinion, today's document is inadequate. The Executive Committee of the Faculty Senate did not, to the best of my knowledge, request any of the material obtained by the University Curriculum Committee regarding academic integrity.

For those interested, I have brought e few copies of related documents. These include the July 2, 1995 letter from Vice President Patton to the Faculty Senate (and the SGA) requesting consideration of academic integrity, the academic integrity policy of Northwestern University (obtained from the Internet), and two documents commenting on student cheating. In a binder I have academic integrity documents or opinions from Northwestern, SUNY Buffalo, Univ. Penn., Southeast Missouri State, Oklahoma State, and other universities.

Wichita State University provides an overview that is focused on (1) how the University disseminates policies and information on academic dishonesty, (2) the process through which dishonest students are identified and punished, and (3) how students can appeal such judgements. Significantly, Vice-President Patton’s response indicates "(t)here is no integrated plan that promotes academic integrity among students, faculty, and administrators accept the acculturation that takes place over time at a University." It is also important to note that the response from WSU does not include a discussion of the reporting and data collection of incidents of student academic dishonesty.

2. Staff also commends the efforts of WSU, PSU, and FHSU but observes that the institutional responses do not address the Board’s policy in its entirety. Staff recommends that WSU develop a more integrated and comprehensive plan to control cheating and promote integrity that includes a centralized reporting mechanism. PSU is asked move beyond its current policies on academic misconduct to develop an approach to promoting academic integrity. PSU should also develop and implement a centralized means of reporting incidents. FHSU is also asked to continue with its efforts, and to develop centralized reporting of incidences of student dishonesty. WSU, PSU, and FHSU should report to the Board in June 1996.
1. It is with a measure of disappointment, although not totally unexpected, that I received a memo from General Counsel Ted Ayres informing me that President Hughes has signed his version of the Dismissal for Cause Policy over the objections of the Faculty Senate. This version allows the university to proceed with a Formal Review Committee even though the Informal Review Committee of faculty peers has found that the charges brought by the administration would not be sufficient, even if substantiated, to warrant dismissal. The policy signed by the president is, in effect, the denial of academic due process of being judged by your peers. This has the effect of removing the protection provided by tenure and assured by the Kansas Board of Regents against arbitrary or capricious actions of administrators.

Last May, upon request of Senate President Terrell and in response to the actions of the senate, I sent a memo to Ted Ayres stating that we were at an impasse with President Hughes over this issue. Therefore, the existing policy in the Faculty Handbook was still the policy in force.

In about late August, President-elect Mandt and I met with President Hughes on this issue. We expressed our concerns about having a policy which allows the administration, and in particular the president, to effectively bypass the findings of duly selected faculty committees and dismiss a tenured faculty member for cause. He stated to us that he felt it was time that faculty exhibited trust in the administration that this route would only be used in exceptional cases. I reminded him that trust is a two-way process. It was also time that the administration exhibited trust in faculty decisions. I continued to say that in the 32 years I have been with WSU, I have never known of a time when an informal review committee didn’t agree with the administration view on the charges brought and therefore recommended a Formal Review Process be started. Also, in those 32 years, I had never heard of a Formal Review taking place; the faculty member either left the university or accepted the conditions of the administration.

I have attached the memo from Ted Ayres to the agenda for today. I am making this statement to let you know that the president chose to approve this policy wording over the objections of the senate and without its approval. In addition, the version signed by the president and put on the Policies and Procedures Manual on the web is not the same version as presented to the senate November 10, 1997. In the version brought to the senate, the president is the only one that
can over-ride the Informal Review Committee recommendations. In the version signed, any university administrator can over-ride these recommendations and start formal proceedings. I know the president has the authority to do this, he has informed us of this fact many times. However, he also has the authority to delegate some responsibility to others in the university. I cannot see how this recent action of the president is in the interest of building trust. It is very obvious to me that he has little trust in the decisions made by the faculty. This action also shows that there is no shared governance with the faculty in this policy or in how it was put into effect. This lack of shared governance was also felt by the SGA as expressed in the editorial of the Sunflower on Wednesday, November 4, over the issue of the transfer of $367,758 of their reserve fund without consultation. It is my opinion that the senate cannot acquiesce on this issue for that would send the message to the faculty and administration that we don’t value shared governance or tenure. Some suggested courses of action will be discussed under “Old Business” today.

2. The two faculty representatives I have appointed to the President’s parking committee are Diane Huntley and Will Klunder. I also plan to have an advisory task force to assist the two representatives in assessing the desires of the faculty and to place priorities on these items for discussion. I currently have the following people in mind for this task but haven’t had the opportunity to see if they are willing to serve: Kirk Lancaster, William Stephenson, Dennis Burns, Larry Paarmann, Thomas Wine and Frank Rokosz. If you can think of others that should be considered please let me know after this meeting.

3. I went to the General Education Retreat October 29 thru 31. There was excitement as faculty talked with administrators about where we have come from and where we saw this program leading. There will be some items coming from the General Education Committee as a result of the discussions and recommendations at this retreat.

4. A charge is currently being written to the Faculty Affairs Committee to generate a WSU Intellectual Property Policy.

5. On Thursday, October 29, some of the faculty met with Regent and Chair Bill Docking, Regent Hammond, and Interim Executive Director Tom Bryant. This was a very productive time. Regent Docking shared with the faculty present the Regents’ position on Coordinating Kansas Post-secondary Education.
6. On Friday, October 30, the Senate Executive Committee met with President-elect Donald Beggs. He shared with us that he intends to meet on a regular basis with the four senate presidents as a way to hear of our concerns and to address common problems. He also asked our advice on several items.
MEMBERS PRESENT: Alagic, Bair, Bajaj, Baxter, Bennett, Born, Brooks, Burns, Byrum, Carroll, Cavarozzi, Celestin, Cheraghi, Chopra, DeLillo, DeSilva, Hodson, Hoyer, Huntley, Klunder, Kraft, Kuhn, Lancaster, Carson. Lescoe-Long, Mandt, Miller, Murphey, Myers, Paarmann, Quantic, Rokosz, Steinke, Terrell, Trechak, Toops, Wine, York

MEMBERS ABSENT: Bahr, Chandler, Gythiel, Hawley, Jackson, Kelly, Kuchment, Pfannenstiel, Rosenthal, Schommer, Sharp, Stevenson, Zettle

MEMBERS EXCUSED: Campbell

Ex-Officio Members Present: Patton, SGA rep. Szambecki

SUMMARY OF ACTION:

1. Accepted the Rules Committee recommendations for the following committees:
   Cathy Moore-Jansen (Library) to the University Curriculum
   Ted Naylor (Library) to the Faculty Affairs

2. The Senate voted to pass the Policy on Student Misconduct and Academic Integrity as amended

3. The Senate voted to add the following statement to the end of the Handbook for Faculty version of the Dismissal for Cause policy: "The Dismissal for Cause policy in the University Policies and Procedures Manual is in conflict with the above policy and is not approved by the Faculty on the grounds that it violates our due process and tenure rights." and passed a resolution that all faculty are to be informed of this action.

I. CALL TO ORDER:
The meeting was called to order by President Hoyer at 3:30 p.m.

II. INFORMAL STATEMENTS AND PROPOSALS: None.

III. APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES:
October 26, 1998, minutes were approved as presented.

IV. PRESIDENT'S REPORT:
A. Dismissal for Cause Policy: President Hoyer read a statement summarizing the background of the new version of this policy and expressing his disappointment that President Hughes signed the new version over the objections of the Faculty Senate and without its approval.

B. Parking Committee: Faculty Senate members appointed to this committee are Diane Huntley and Will Klunder. The executive committee would also like an advisory task force to assist the two representatives in assessing the desires of the faculty and to place priorities on these items for discussion. They have not had the opportunity to ask the following Senator to serve on this task force, Senators Lancaster, Stevenson, Burns, Paarmann, Wine and Rokosz. He requested any other recommendations at the end of this meeting.

C. General Education Retreat Oct. 29-30, 1998: Hoyer noted the excitement as faculty talked with administrators about where we have come from and where this program is going. There
will be some items coming from the General Education Committee as a result of the discussions and recommendations at this retreat.

D. **WSU Intellectual Property Policy:** A charge is currently being written to the Faculty Affairs Committee to generate a WSU Intellectual Property Policy.

E. **Meeting with Board of Regents:** On Thursday, October 29th, the faculty that met with Regent Chair Bill Docking, Regent Hammond, and Interim Executive Director Tom Bryant felt it was a very productive meeting. Regent Docking shared the Regent's position on Coordinating Kansas Post-secondary Education.

F. **Meeting with President-elect Beggs:** On Friday, October 30th, the Senate Executive Committee met with President-elect Donald Beggs. He shared that he intends to meet on a regular basis with the four senate presidents as a way to hear of our concerns and to address common problems.

V. **COMMITTEE REPORTS:**

A. **Rules Committee:**

1. A.J. Mandt proposed the following appointments:
   - Cathy Moore-Jansen to the University Curriculum Committee
   - Ted Naylor to the Faculty Affairs Committee
   All were accepted.

2. Reapportionment of the Faculty Senate: Since there is an imbalance in Senate representation among the colleges, and the Rules Committee feels that maintaining the 12:1 ratio is important, the Rules Committee proposes to reapportion the seats as follows: Health Professions will gain two seats; LAS will lose two seats; Engineering will lose one seat. A.J. Mandt will advise the Deans of the colleges involved of this and notify them when it is time to proceed.

VI. **OLD BUSINESS:**

A. **Policy on Student Misconduct and Academic Integrity (5.07):** Senator Cavarozzi presented the report from the Select committee and stated that WSU has a process which has worked very well for many years, but that the Board of Regents wanted some clarifications. This current draft of the policy (as attached to the agenda) does not change the policy so much as it clarifies it. This policy is a support of process for the students.

Some Senators voiced concerns with this draft: 1) This policy does not come close to meeting the Board of Regents charge to us and we should explore the potential for each college having its own policy, and work toward more severe penalties for cheating than failing the course. 2) The wording of section 5.072/Procedures for Academic Appeals in #1 which is lined out is necessary, although it might need to be placed elsewhere. 3) The only time cases are recorded is if they are protested.

A motion was made by Senator Cavarozzi (second by Byrum) with regard to Section 5.072 to move the last sentences of #1 (which are lined out) to the beginning of #6. Thus, #6 would read:

> A student must file an appeal within one semester after the grade is assigned (excluding summer). (The Court reserves the right, in exceptional circumstances, to suspend this rule.) The completed appeal is returned by the student to the office of the Dean of Students for distribution...."

Motion passed.

A motion was made by Senator Cavarozzi (seconded by Carroll) to amend section 5.07C to read:

"If a faculty member disciplines a student for academic misconduct, that information may be reported in writing to the Chair of the faculty member's department.” Motion passed.
The Senate accepted the policy as amended. Hoyer thanked the committee for their work.

B. Discussion on how to display the Dismissal for Cause Policy on the Handbook for Faculty website: After discussion of options, the Senate took the following actions:
1. It directed the Executive Committee to not change the wording of the Dismissal for Cause Policy as it appears in the Handbook for Faculty and as it appears in the web site, even though this Policy disagrees with the one shown in the Policies and Procedures section of the web.
2. A motion was made by Senator Mandt (second Bair) that the following statement be added to the end of the Handbook for Faculty version in the Dismissal for Cause Policy:
"The Dismissal for Cause policy in the University Policies and Procedures Manual is in conflict with the above policy and is not approved by the Faculty on the grounds that it violates our due process and tenure rights."
Motion passed unanimously.
3. A motion was made by Senator Baxter (second Quantic) that a communication be sent to all faculty informing them of the issue and the Senate's actions. Motion passed.

In addition, a recommendation was made that President-elect Beggs be informed of this issue and asked to deal with it as soon as possible. Hoyer stated he has already sent a letter to Beggs informing him of our concern.

VII. NEW BUSINESS: None

VIII. AS MAY ARISE: President Hoyer provided the web address for the Board of Regents' Faculty Initiative: http://www.ukans.edu/~kbor/facsal2.html

The meeting was adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Nan Myers, Secretary