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[no change]

University Of California Policies Applying to Campus Activities, Organizations, and Students, section 100.00 Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline states that "Chancellors may impose discipline for the commission or attempted commission (including aiding or abetting in the commission or attempted commission) of the following types of violations by students...:

102.1 All forms of academic misconduct including but not limited to cheating, fabrication, plagiarism, or facilitating academic dishonesty.

102.2 Other forms of dishonesty including but not limited to fabricating information, furnishing false information, or reporting a false emergency to the University."

Principles of Academic Integrity

At the University of California, Riverside (UCR) honesty and integrity are fundamental values that guide and inform us as individuals and as a community. The culture of academia requires that each student take responsibility for learning and for products that reflect their intellectual potential, curiosity, and capability. Students must represent themselves truthfully, claim only work that is their own, acknowledge their use of others’ words, research results, and ideas, using the methods accepted by the appropriate academic disciplines and engage honestly in all academic assignments. Anything less than total commitment to honesty circumvents the contract for intellectual enrichment.
that students have with the University to become an educated person, undermines the efforts of the entire academic community, and diminishes the value of an education for everyone, especially for the person who cheats. Both students and faculty are responsible for ensuring the academic integrity of the University.

These guidelines establish definitions for academic misconduct and procedures for the adjudication of academic integrity cases by the Office of Student Conduct and Academic Integrity Programs (SCAIP) for undergraduate students and Graduate Division for graduate student cases.

Misunderstanding of appropriate academic conduct will not be accepted as an excuse for academic misconduct. If a student is in doubt about appropriate academic conduct in a particular situation, he or she should consult with the instructor in the course to avoid the serious charge of academic misconduct.

Types of Academic Misconduct

The following provides definitions of academic misconduct to assist students in developing an understanding of the University’s expectations, recognizing that no set of written guidelines can anticipate all types and degrees of violations of academic integrity. To the extent that these definitions are not exhaustive, duly appointed representatives of the University will judge each case according to its merits.

Academic misconduct is any act that does or could improperly distort student grades or other student academic records.

Cheating. Fraud, deceit, or dishonesty in an academic assignment, or using or attempting to use materials, or assisting others in using materials that are prohibited or inappropriate in the context of the academic assignment in question.

Fabrication. Making up data or results and recording or reporting them, including laboratory or field research results. In the context of student academic integrity, this also includes falsifying academic or university documents and providing false information or testimony in connection with
Procedures

Requirements and Expectations

Research
To foster intellectual honesty, schools, departments, and research units at UCR are encouraged to develop statements that fit the distinctive research climate and needs of their individual disciplines. These guidelines may cover responsibilities of research supervisors, assignment of credit for publications, training of research apprentices, requirements for record keeping of experimental procedures and data storage, and standards for any investigation or hearing under this policy.

Plagiarism. The appropriation of another person’s ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit. This includes the copying of language, structure, or ideas of another and attributing (explicitly or implicitly) the work to one’s own efforts. Plagiarism means using another's work without giving credit.

Facilitating academic dishonesty. Assisting another in violating the policy of Academic Integrity, such as taking an exam for another student or providing coursework for another student to turn in as his or her own effort.

Unauthorized collaboration. Working with others without the specific permission of the instructor on assignments that will be submitted for a grade. This applies to in-class or take-home tests, papers, labs, or homework assignments. Students may not collaborate without faculty authorization.

Interference or sabotage. Damaging, removing, or otherwise harming another student’s work or University materials and systems to affect the academic performance of others.

Failure to comply with research regulations such as those applying to human subjects, laboratory animals, and standards of safety.

Retaliation of any kind against a person who reported or provided information about suspected or alleged misconduct and who has not acted in bad faith.

UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS

Requirements and Expectations

Research
To foster intellectual honesty with regard to undergraduate research, all academic units at UCR are encouraged to develop statements that fit the distinctive research climate and needs of their individual disciplines. These guidelines may cover responsibilities of research supervisors, assignment of credit for publications, training of research apprentices, requirements for record keeping of experimental procedures and data storage.
merits and promotions which value quality over quantity.

It is the responsibility of each individual engaged in research at UCR to be informed of University policies relating to research and of the policies and procedures of the agencies funding his or her research. Copies of relevant policies are available in the Office of Research and will be provided at no cost.

Courses
Faculty members, teaching assistants, and other instructional personnel are encouraged to include statements addressing academic integrity as part of the syllabus for every course and to educate students about expectations and standards in the context of the course in order that students may not, through ignorance, subject themselves to the charge of academic misconduct. Instructors are further encouraged to inform students of campus resources available for dealing with academic difficulty.

Undergraduate Procedures
Throughout the process of reviewing allegations of academic misconduct, this policy articulates deadlines for action based on calendar days. If the day of a deadline falls on a weekend, holiday, or day the University is otherwise closed, that deadline will be moved to the next day the University is open.

IV. Faculty Actions
Research
In cases of alleged academic integrity violations in research, faculty members, teaching assistants, and other instructional personnel should report suspicion of fraudulent or unethical research practice by students immediately to the Chair of the department, Dean of the school or Director of the organized research unit. The report must then be forwarded to the Associate Dean for Research who will be responsible for coordinating further actions.

I. Faculty Actions
[no change]

In cases of alleged academic integrity violations in undergraduate research, faculty members, teaching assistants, and other instructional personnel should report suspicion of fraudulent or unethical research practice by students, including but not limited to undergraduate student researcher employees, immediately to the Chair of the department, Dean of the school or Director of the organized research unit. The report must then be forwarded to the Vice Chancellor for Research who will be responsible for coordinating further actions.
If a faculty member, teaching assistant, or other instructional personnel suspects that an act of academic misconduct has occurred in a course, she must communicate with the student regarding the alleged act of misconduct and the information upon which the allegation is based within 30 business days of discovery of the alleged act. Under special circumstances, the instructor may make a request for an extension of time through the Vice Provost for Conflict Resolution. Whenever possible, the communication should take place through an in-person consultation and should be conducted in a manner that respects each student's privacy and maintains an environment that supports teaching and learning. When a meeting is not possible or practical, an instructor may communicate with the student in writing. Written communication will be sent by U.S. mail to the address most recently filed with the Registrar's Office, or to the student's University e-mail address. When multiple students are involved, faculty are encouraged to communicate with each student separately. An instructor may request the assistance of the Ombudsperson or a member of the Student Judicial Affairs staff to be present at the conference to assist in a fair and focused discussion about what may have occurred.

The student must be given the opportunity to respond to the allegation of misconduct. When communication is made in writing, students will be given 10 business days to respond. After conferring with the student and/or considering the student's written response, the instructor will determine whether it is more likely than not that the student committed an act of academic misconduct. In making this determination the instructor will pay attention not to whether the student meant to engage in misconduct, but whether the misconduct occurred. The instructor may then follow up with one of the following:

[no change]
actions:

A. In cases where the instructor determines that there is no misconduct, s/he may dismiss the allegation and take no further action.

B. In cases where the student does not dispute the facts upon which the charges are based, the instructor may impose an appropriate academic sanction, taking into account the clarity of course expectations, the level of the student's experience or knowledge of principles of academic integrity, the nature of the assignment, and the degree of intentionality and pre-mediation of the misconduct.

Actions taken must be documented through the Academic Misconduct Referral form, or a referral memo to Student Judicial Affairs, the central location where all records of incidents of academic dishonesty are kept on file. It is essential that the form or referral memo include the student's name and student identification number, the name of the class in which the act took place, the date or time period in which the act occurred, a description of the academic misconduct, a summary of actions taken, all original documentation supporting the charge, and the academic sanctions assigned.

C. In cases where the student disputes the facts upon which the charges are based, the instructor will refer the case to Student Judicial Affairs. The Academic Misconduct Referral form or memo must include the student's name and student identification number, the name of the class in which the act took place, the date or time period in which the act occurred, a description of the academic misconduct, a summary of actions taken, all original documentation supporting the charge (except where prohibited by law), and the academic sanctions recommended. Faculty are encouraged to forward a copy of the course syllabus and other written communication that addresses academic integrity standards and expectations for the course. Faculty are further encouraged to evaluate the assignment or examination on its merits and to make note of the grade to be assigned in the event that the student is not found responsible for violation of the intent to engage in misconduct, the instructor may then pursue one of the following actions:

A. In cases where the student does not dispute the facts upon which the charges are based, the instructor may impose an appropriate academic sanction, taking into account the clarity of course expectations, the level of the student's experience or knowledge of principles of academic integrity, the nature of the assignment, and the degree of intentionality and pre-mediation of the misconduct. These admissions of guilt and the sanction the instructor imposes are final.

B. In cases where the student disputes the facts upon which the charges are based, the instructor will refer the case to SCAIP. The Academic Misconduct Referral form or memo must include the student's name and student identification number, the name of the class in which the act took place, the date or time period in which the act occurred, a description of the academic misconduct, a summary of actions taken by the instructor, all original documentation supporting the charge (except where prohibited by law), and the academic sanctions recommended. Faculty members are encouraged to forward a copy of the course syllabus and other written communication that addresses academic integrity standards and expectations for the course. Faculty are further encouraged to evaluate the assignment or examination on its merits and to make note of the grade to be assigned in the event that the student is not found responsible for violation of the
University's policies or where insufficient evidence exists to hold the student responsible.

Instructors who are in part-time or temporary appointments or who will be on sabbatical or other leave or who will be leaving the University are required to provide a copy of all documentation to the Department Chair, who will serve as a proxy for the instructor if s/he is unavailable to participate fully in resolving the allegations of misconduct.

If grades are awarded while the case is in progress, the faculty member will assign a temporary grade placeholder of Grade Delay ‘GD’ pending the outcome of the process.

D. Violations that the instructor believes to be particularly egregious shall be referred directly to the College Academic Integrity Committee in the instructor's College for review.

Course Drops and Withdrawals A student officially notified of alleged academic misconduct may not withdraw from the course until the determination of responsibility is made and any sanctions are imposed. A sanction for a violation of academic integrity that affects the course grade will be applied. The student may not avoid the imposition of a sanction by withdrawing from a course. If the student is found not responsible for academic misconduct, the student will be permitted to withdraw from the course with a grade of "W".

The student may not avoid the imposition of a sanction by withdrawing from a course. If the student is found not responsible for academic misconduct, the student will be permitted to request a withdrawal from the course with a grade of "W" using Undergraduate Enrollment Adjustment Procedures.
III. Administrative Actions

Research

The Associate Dean for Research, in consultation with the original recipient of the report, will review the description of the academic misconduct and documentation supporting the charge and determine if unethical conduct may have occurred, and if so, may undertake a preliminary inquiry or formal investigation following the guidelines outlined in UCR Policy on Integrity in Research, posted on the Office of Research Affairs website at {http://www.ora.ucr.edu/ORA/announce/integrit.htm}. In the event that the preliminary inquiry or formal investigation finds probable cause to warrant disciplinary proceedings, charges of misconduct will be processed in accordance with existing procedures for adjudicating alleged academic misconduct in courses.

Courses

The table below shows the steps in the investigation and review process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible Body: Undergraduate Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiation of Cases</td>
<td>Faculty member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Faculty member’s suspicion of misconduct in a course, communication with student, and determination of outcome</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Faculty member documents actions via Academic Misconduct Referral Form for Review Stage 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Stage 1</td>
<td>Student Conduct and Academic Integrity Programs [SCAIP]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Administrative Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Stage 2</td>
<td>Academic Integrity Committees of each college/school [AICs]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hearings for cases that are complex, egregious, and/or repeated cases of misconduct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Appeals of decisions made at Review Stage 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing panels constituted from the AICs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A. In cases where the student does not dispute the facts upon which the charges are based, Student Judicial Affairs, upon receipt of the Academic Misconduct Referral form, will follow up with the student in writing to formally advise the student of the academic sanctions assigned by the instructor as well as appropriate disciplinary sanctions assigned by the University.

The decision shall be forwarded in writing to the student within 15 business days of the review; and communicated to the instructor, college and/or division in accordance with legitimate educational interest criteria as articulated by the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act.

Students with a record of previous academic misconduct will be referred to the Academic Integrity Committee in their College for a formal hearing, with a recommendation that suspension or dismissal be considered.

B. In cases where the student disputes the facts upon which the charges are based, upon receipt of an Academic Misconduct Referral Form from an instructor, Student Judicial Affairs will notify the student of the University Policy that was allegedly violated; the factual basis for the charges; and the right to be assisted by an advisor of choice or an attorney (at his or her own expense) and ask the student to schedule an Administrative Review. Within 15 working days of the referral of the matter to the SJA, notification will be sent to the student by U.S. mail to the address most recently filed with the Registrar’s Office, or to the student's University e-mail address.

A. In cases where the student does not dispute the facts upon which the charges are based, SCAIP, upon receipt of the Academic Misconduct Referral form, will follow up with the student in writing to formally advise the student of the academic sanctions assigned by the instructor as well as appropriate disciplinary sanctions assigned by the University.

The decision shall be forwarded in writing to the student within 20 calendar days of the review; and communicated to the instructor, school or college and/or division in accordance with legitimate educational interest criteria as articulated by the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act.

Students with a record of previous academic misconduct will be referred to the Academic Integrity Committee in their School or College for a formal hearing (Review Stage 2) hearing, with a recommendation that suspension or dismissal be considered.

B. In cases where the student disputes the facts upon which the charges are based, upon receipt of the Academic Misconduct Referral Form, SCAIP will notify the student of their alleged violation of the University of California Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline, the factual basis for the charges, and the plan to conduct a Review Stage 1 Administrative Review of the case. The student will be advised that the Administrative Review is intended as a thorough exposition of all related facts and written materials associated with the alleged misconduct, and that it is not intended as an adversarial criminal or civil legal proceeding. It is not modeled on these adversarial systems; nor does it serve the same functions; rather, it is an academic process unique to the community of scholars that comprise a University. The student will also be informed of his or her right to be assisted by an advisor of his or her choice. Such written
Whenever possible an Administrative Review will be scheduled such that both the faculty member and the student can attend. The purpose of an Administrative Review is to explore and investigate the incident giving rise to the appearance of academic dishonesty, and to reach an informed conclusion as to whether or not academic dishonesty occurred. In keeping with the ultimate premise and justification of academic life, the duty of all persons at a Review is to assist in a thorough and honest exposition of all related facts. A Review is not in the character of a criminal or civil legal proceeding. It is not modeled on these adversarial systems; nor does it serve the same functions; rather, it is an academic process unique to the community of scholars that comprise a University.

The review will:
* explain fully the alleged violation of the Standards of Conduct
* review written materials associated with the alleged misconduct
* give the student and the instructor the opportunity to present their accounts of the incident and present any witnesses or other individuals who may have relevant information about the incident
* address how the student's alleged conduct was judged, why the behavior is unacceptable, the impact of conduct on others in the community, causes and motives of the conduct, and alternatives for balancing personal circumstances with needs and expectations of the community

1. Review Stage 1, Administrative Review, process:

The Administrative Review conducted by SCAIP involves meetings with the student, the Faculty member, and others who may have relevant information. The student will have the opportunity to discuss any extenuating circumstances, causes, and motivations that may have contributed to the alleged misconduct. If SCAIP deems it necessary, the Administrative Review will be scheduled such that both the faculty member and the student can attend. The purpose of an Administrative Review is to explore and investigate the incident giving rise to the appearance of academic dishonesty, and to reach an informed conclusion as to whether or not academic dishonesty occurred. In keeping with the ultimate premise and justification of academic life, the duty of all persons at a Review is to assist in a thorough and honest exposition of all related facts. A Review is not in the character of a criminal or civil legal proceeding. It is not modeled on these adversarial systems; nor does it serve the same functions; rather, it is an academic process unique to the community of scholars that comprise a University.
In the event that Student Judicial Affairs determines it is more likely than not that the student is responsible for academic misconduct, the academic sanctions recommended by the faculty member as well as appropriate disciplinary sanctions will be assigned taking into account the clarity of course expectations, the level of the student's experience or knowledge of principles of academic integrity, the nature of the assignment, and the degree of intentionality and premeditation of the misconduct.

The decision shall be forwarded in writing to the student within 15 business days of the review and communicated to the instructor, college and/or division in accordance with legitimate educational interest criteria as articulated by the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act. In cases where the instructor has held a grade in abeyance pending the outcome of an Administrative Review, he shall submit a final grade with the Registrar that is consistent with the decision of Student Judicial Affairs as to the question of misconduct.

In the event that Student Judicial Affairs receives an allegation of academic misconduct by a student who previously has been charged and found responsible for academic misconduct or encounters a case that is sufficiently complex to require additional consultation the case will be referred to the Academic Integrity Committee in the instructor's College, with the request that the case be resolved through a formal hearing.

IV. Academic Integrity Committees

College Academic Integrity Committees
An Academic Integrity Committee will be established in each of the and for the Graduate Division/Professional Schools to:
* hear cases referred by Student Judicial Affairs

2. Outcome of the Administrative Review:

If SCAIP determines it is more likely than not that the student is responsible for academic misconduct, the academic sanctions recommended by the faculty member as well as appropriate disciplinary sanctions will be assigned taking into account the clarity of course expectations, the level of the student's experience or knowledge of principles of academic integrity, the nature of the assignment, and the degree of intentionality and premeditation of the misconduct.

The decision shall be forwarded in writing to the student within 20 calendar days of the review and communicated to the instructor, school or college and/or division in accordance with legitimate educational interest criteria as articulated by the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act. In cases where the instructor has held a grade in abeyance pending the outcome of an Administrative Review, she or he shall submit a final grade with the Registrar that is consistent with the decision of SCAIP as to the question of misconduct.

3. Appeals of Decisions by Faculty Members and/or from Review Stage 1.

Academic Integrity Committees, described in Section C function as the appellate bodies for decisions made at Review Stage 1. Section E below more fully explains appeal procedures.

C. Cases involving a student with a record of previous academic misconduct or cases that are sufficiently complex to require additional consultation shall be referred directly by SCAIP for a Stage 2 review by the Academic Integrity Committee in the relevant college/school for a formal hearing.

1. Review Stage 2, College/School Academic Integrity Committees for Cases Involving Undergraduate Students

An Academic Integrity Committee will be established in each of School or College to:
* hear cases referred by SCAIP that are sufficiently
that are sufficiently complex to require additional review
* hear serious and repeated violations of academic misconduct upon referral from an instructor or
Student Judicial Affairs
* hear appeals of decisions and/or sanctions imposed by an instructor or Student Judicial Affairs.

In the spring quarter, the Academic Senate’s Committee on Committees will appoint four faculty members from each of BCOE, CNAS, and SOBA, and six from CHASS to the undergraduate Academic Integrity Committees for each college/school to serve one-year terms, effective September 1-August 31. Each committee should include faculty who are available to participate in hearings during the summer months.

Four to six full-time undergraduate students, and four to six graduate students will be appointed to each College Committee and shall serve one-year terms effective July 1-June 30.

In addition, SCAIP will solicit and review applications from interested undergraduate and graduate students and make recommendations to the Associated Students of UCR and Graduate Student Association regarding students to be appointed to serve on each college/school committee for one-year terms, effective September 1-August 31. The final endorsement of student members will rest with the Committee on Committees. Students are not eligible to serve if they have been suspended or are on academic or disciplinary probation, have been evicted from University Housing for reasons related to conduct, or have a case pending before SCAIP. (Am 20 February 07)

In all cases an effort will be made to appoint members who represent the disciplinary diversity within each college.

The undergraduates shall be chosen from the undergraduate student body by the Associated Students of UCR. The graduate students shall be chosen from the graduate student body by the Graduate Student Association. Students who have been suspended or are on academic or disciplinary probation, evicted from University Housing for...
reasons related to conduct, or who have a case pending before the Student Conduct Committee or an Academic Integrity Committee are not eligible to serve as committee members. (Am 20 February 07)

A hearing panel of 3-5 members will be drawn from the pool of appointees for each case. A quorum of the committee consists of three persons, with at least one faculty member, one student for College Committees and one faculty member and one graduate student for the Graduate/Professional School Committee. In the absence of a quorum, the hearing will be rescheduled. Staff support to the Committee will be provided by the Vice Provost for Conflict Resolution or his/her designee.

The purpose of an Academic Integrity Committee Hearing is to explore and investigate the incident giving rise to the appearance of academic dishonesty, and to reach an informed conclusion as to whether or not academic dishonesty occurred. In keeping with the ultimate premise and justification of academic life, the duty of all persons at a hearing is to assist in a thorough and honest exposition of all related facts. A hearing is not in the character of a criminal or civil legal proceeding. It is not modeled on these adversarial systems; nor does it serve the same functions; rather, it is an academic process unique to the community of scholars that comprise a University.

The Vice Provost for Conflict Resolution or his/her designee will serve as a non-voting administrative chair to facilitate the hearing. The administrative chair shall rule on all questions of procedure and evidence, including but not limited to: the order of presentation of evidence, admissibility of evidence, applicability of regulations to a particular case, and relevance of testimony. An Academic Integrity Committee Hearing will normally proceed as follows:

Preparation: Prior to the hearing, panel members will receive and review a copy of the notification of charges and documentary evidence provided by the instructor, the University, and the student.

2. Hearing Panels

SCAIP will schedule a hearing panel of three to five members, from the relevant AIC for each case. A quorum of the committee consists of three persons, with at least one faculty member and one student for School or College Committees. In the absence of a quorum, the hearing will be rescheduled. Staff support to the Committee will be provided by the Vice Provost for Administrative Resolution or his/her designee.

[no change]
Introductory comments: At the beginning of the hearing, the administrative chair will ask all present at the hearing to introduce themselves for the record. The administrative chair will ask any panel members to disqualify themselves from participation if they believe for any reason that they cannot render a just and fair decision and will permit the student to request that a member be disqualified if the student believes for an appropriate reason that a panel member cannot render a just and fair decision. If a student or faculty member of the hearing panel is disqualified, another member will be appointed to fill the same role, if needed for a quorum. The chair will read aloud the charges of academic misconduct and the student will be asked to respond to the charges by (a) accepting responsibility, (b) accepting responsibility and noting that there are mitigating circumstances, or (c) denying responsibility for the alleged violation of the University of California Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline.

Presentation of accounts: The faculty member and the student will be given the opportunity to present their accounts of the incident and present any witnesses or other individuals who may have relevant information about the alleged academic misconduct. Hearing panel members will be given an opportunity to ask questions of the faculty member, the student, and witnesses. Each party will then be asked if there is additional information needed, or if any discrepancies or questions need to be presented or addressed.

Deliberation: The hearing panel will deliberate in private to decide, by a majority vote, if a preponderance of the evidence indicates that the student is responsible or not responsible for alleged violation of University of California Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline.

If the student is found to be responsible for violations of the Policy, the Committee shall be
violations of, the Committee shall be informed of the student's prior record to determine whether the student has been found responsible for previous academic misconduct. Based on this information, the Committee will determine the sanction(s) to be assigned, how and for how long the record of the sanction will be maintained on the student's permanent record, and the conditions that must be met for the record to be removed, if any. In the event that the Committee determines that dismissal is warranted for a graduate student, this determination must be framed as a recommendation and forwarded to the Dean of the Graduate Division for review and approval.

I. Once the Committee has reached a decision on the sanction(s), the Chair will ask the parties involved to return to the room, and the results of the deliberation will be presented. Within fifteen business days, the Vice Provost for Conflict Resolution or his/her designee will mail notification to the student and instructor, and college or division detailing the decision and the sanctions imposed by the Committee and outlining the appeal process.

A tape recording of the hearing, but not the deliberations, shall be made and retained in Student Judicial Affairs as part of the record for as long as the disciplinary record is retained, or for five years from the date of decision, whichever is shorter. The student may obtain a copy of the recording upon paying the expense of making such copy. Either party may arrange for a stenographer to make a full transcript of the proceedings at his/her own expense. If one party has the proceedings transcribed, arrangements shall be made before the hearing as to how to apportion the cost if both parties want copies. Other than for the purpose of the official record as provided above, mechanical or electronic devices for recording or broadcasting shall be excluded from the hearing.

1. The Academic Integrity Committee for the College of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences shall address violations associated with Business Administration faculty and undergraduate students informed of the student's prior record to determine whether the student has been found responsible for previous academic misconduct. Based on this information, the Committee will determine the sanction(s) to be assigned.

Notification of decision: Once the hearing panel has reached a decision, the parties involved will reassemble, and the results of the deliberation will be presented. Within 20 calendar days, the Vice Provost for Administrative Resolution or his/her designee will send written notification to the student, the faculty member, and the dean or his/her designated associate dean for student academic affairs of the college/school detailing the decision and the sanctions imposed by the hearing panel. The notification will also outline the appeal process.

Records: An audio recording of the hearing, but not the deliberations, shall be made and retained in SCAIP as part of the record for as long as the disciplinary record is retained, or for seven years from the date of decision, whichever is shorter (see Section F below). The student may obtain a copy of the recording upon paying the expense of making such copy. Either the student with conduct under investigation or the faculty member may arrange for a stenographer to make a full transcript of the proceedings at his/her own expense. If one party has the proceedings transcribed, arrangements shall be made before the hearing as to how to apportion the cost if both parties want copies. Other than for the purpose of the official record as provided above, mechanical or electronic devices for recording or broadcasting shall be excluded from the hearing.
as articulated in these procedures. The Academic Integrity committee for Graduate/Professional Schools shall address alleged violations by credential and graduate students in Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences, Natural and Agricultural Sciences, Engineering, the School of Education, and the School of Management.

Campus Academic Integrity Executive Committee

One faculty member and one student from the Academic Integrity Committee in each College will make up a Campus Academic Integrity Executive Committee. The Executive Committee will:

- review, on an annual basis, cases addressed through instructors and Student Judicial Affairs; to provide oversight and direction and to ensure that policies and procedures are appropriate and properly applied
- hear appeals of primary/non-appellate decisions and sanctions of a College Academic Integrity Committee

$\nabla$, Appeals

Stage 1 Review decisions made by SCAIP may be appealed through the College Academic Integrity Committee in the faculty member’s College. Appellate decisions of a College Academic Integrity Committee are final.

Primary decisions of a College Academic Integrity Committee may be appealed to the Campus Academic Integrity Executive Committee. Appellate decisions of the Campus Academic Integrity Executive Committee are final.

Stage 2 Review decisions made by a School or College Academic Integrity Committee may be appealed to the Campus Academic Integrity Executive Committee. Appellate decisions of the Campus Academic Integrity Executive Committee are final.

2. Criteria for Appeals

Appeals must be based on one or more of the following:

* evidence not reasonably available at the time of the original hearing, the absence of which can be
shown to have had a detrimental impact on the outcome of the hearing
* error that can be shown to have had a detrimental impact on the outcome of the hearing
* in the interpretation of University policy so substantial as to deny one of the parties a fair hearing
* inappropriate sanction having no reasonable relationship to the charges

3. Appeal Procedures

* The Faculty member or the student may appeal a decision in writing to the appropriate body for appeal, as described above. The appeal must be made within 14 calendar days after the written decision is made available. Appeals must be authored and signed by the submitting party. Appeals produced by advisors or other non-parties will not be considered.

* The filing of a timely appeal suspends the imposition of sanctions until the appeal is decided. Grades or degrees may be withheld pending conclusion of the appeal.

When an appeal has been filed, the non-appealing party, whether student or Faculty member, will be notified of the appeal as soon it has been received by the appropriate appellate body and will be given an opportunity to submit a written statement for consideration during the appeal process.

* The appellate body will determine whether the grounds for appeal have been satisfied and whether further process is necessary to resolve the appeal. Findings of fact will be accepted as determined by the original adjudicating body, unless the appellate body determines that the original adjudicating body acted in an arbitrary, capricious, or unfair manner.

* The appellate body may approve, reject, or modify the decision and sanction in question. The action taken shall be communicated in writing to the student, the faculty member, and Student Judicial Affairs.
within fifteen (15) working days after receipt of the appeal and related documents. The decision of the appeal committee is final.

VI. Maintenance Of Records

Student Judicial Affairs shall serve as the central location where all written, audio, and electronic records of incidents of academic misconduct are kept on file. The records will be readily available for review by the Deans and Associate Deans of each College, the Dean of the Graduate Division, the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost and the Vice Provost for Conflict Resolution in accordance with legitimate educational interest criteria as articulated by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act.

The file of a student found in violation of campus regulations (including the transcripts or recordings of the hearing) will be maintained by Student Judicial Affairs for a period of at least five years from the date of the letter providing notice of final disciplinary action, unless otherwise determined by the Assistant Provost for Conflict Resolution. When, as a result of a violation of the Standards of Conduct, a student is suspended, the fact that suspension was imposed must be posted on the academic transcript for the duration of the suspension. When a student is dismissed, the fact that dismissal was imposed must be posted on the academic transcript permanently.

G. Scheduling for Hearings and Appeals

In general, Academic Integrity Committees will conduct hearing panels September through June, the main academic year. In special circumstances, including hearings involving graduating seniors and those involving course sequences and prerequisites, SCAIP and the Academic Integrity Committees will work to expedite the process and endeavor to hold summer hearings on a limited basis.
GRADUATE STUDENTS

1. Requirements and Expectations in Research

To foster intellectual honesty with regard to graduate student research, all academic units at UCR are encouraged to develop statements that fit the distinctive research climate and needs of their individual disciplines. These guidelines may cover responsibilities of research supervisors, assignment of authorship or credit for publications, training of research apprentices, requirements for record keeping of experimental procedures and data storage.

It is the responsibility of each individual engaged in research at UCR to be informed of University policies relating to research and of the policies and procedures of the agencies funding research. Relevant policies are posted on the UCR Office of Research website.

2. Allegations of Misconduct in Research

All allegations of research misconduct by graduate students should be immediately reported to the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs in the Graduate Division. The Associate Dean will then inform the Vice Chancellor for Research who serves as the UCR Research Integrity Officer and who, in furtherance of the University's obligations and responsibilities, has been delegated the administrative authority by the Chancellor with respect to the oversight, implementation, maintenance and updating of the Policy and Procedures for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct at the University Of California, Riverside. All complainants should consult the Policy and Procedures for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct at the University Of California, Riverside prior to bringing an allegation of research misconduct to the Associate Dean.

The Vice Chancellor for Research or his/her designee will review the description of the research misconduct and all documentation supporting the charge. He/she will determine, together with the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs, if
misconduct may have occurred, and if so, may undertake a preliminary inquiry or formal investigation, following the guidelines outlined in the UCR Policy on Integrity in Research, posted on the UCR Office of Research website. In the event that the preliminary inquiry or formal investigation finds probable cause with respect to research misconduct to warrant disciplinary proceedings, charges of misconduct will be processed in accordance with procedures for adjudicating alleged academic misconduct in courses, as outlined below, beginning with Review Stage 1.

3. Requirements and Expectations in Courses

Instructional personnel responsible for courses (herein referred to as Faculty) are encouraged to include statements addressing academic integrity as part of the syllabus for every course and to educate students about expectations and standards of the course in order that students may not, through ignorance, subject themselves to the charge of academic misconduct. Faculty are further encouraged to inform students of campus resources available for dealing with academic difficulty.

4. Allegations of Misconduct in Courses

The table below shows the steps in the investigation and review process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible Body</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initiation of Cases</strong></td>
<td>• Faculty member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communication with the student regarding suspected misconduct and documentation of actions via the Graduate Academic Misconduct Referral Form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review Stage 1</strong></td>
<td>• Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Initial [Administrative] Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review Stage 2</strong></td>
<td>• Graduate Academic Integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hearings for cases that are complex, egregious, and/or repeated cases of</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
misconduct
• Appeals of decisions made at Review Stage 1

Committee
[GAIC]

Review Stage 3
• Annual assessments of cases addressed at Review Stages 1 & 2
• Appeals of primary decisions made at Review Stage 2

• Graduate Council

4.1 Initiation of Cases

If a Faculty member suspects that an act of academic misconduct has occurred in a course, he or she must promptly communicate with the student regarding the alleged misconduct and the information upon which the allegation is based; the notification process must occur within 30 calendar days from the discovery of the alleged act. The Faculty member may make a request for an extension of time through the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs. If the discovery is made by a student, teaching assistant, reader, grader or tutor he or she should immediately communicate to the Faculty member in charge of the course, so that the Faculty member in charge can proceed with the investigation.

Whenever possible, communication with the student should take place through an in-person consultation and should be conducted in a manner that respects the student's privacy and maintains an environment that supports teaching and learning. When multiple students are involved, Faculty are encouraged to communicate with each student separately. The Faculty member or the student may request the presence at the consultation meeting of the Ombudsperson.

When an in-person meeting is not possible, the Faculty member may communicate with the student in writing. Written communication should be sent to the student’s University e-mail address.

The student must be given the opportunity to respond to the allegation of misconduct. When communication is made in writing, students will be given 10 calendar days to respond.
After conferring with the student and/or considering the student’s written response, the Faculty member may determine that there has been no misconduct, in which case the Faculty member may dismiss the allegation and take no further action.

If the Faculty member determines that it is more likely than not that the student committed an act of academic misconduct, regardless of the student’s intent to engage in misconduct, the case moves to Stage 1 in the review process.

Faculty members who will not be available to participate fully in resolving allegations (e.g., Individuals holding part-time or temporary appointments, those on sabbatical or other leave, or those leaving University employment) must provide a copy of all documentation to the immediate supervising administrator: department chair, program director, center director, or dean of school, who will serve as a proxy for the Faculty member to conclude the case.

If grades are awarded while the case is in progress, the Faculty member should assign a temporary grade placeholder of Grade Delay “GD” pending the outcome of the review process.

4.1.1 Student Admits Responsibility

If the student admits responsibility for the alleged misconduct, the Faculty member may immediately impose an appropriate academic sanction. The faculty member must document the case and the sanction on the Graduate Academic Misconduct Referral form and send the form to the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs. Faculty members are advised to consult with the Graduate Advisor for the student’s program and with the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs prior to imposing the academic sanction.

4.1.2 Student Does Not Admit Responsibility

If the student does not admit responsibility but the Faculty member makes a determination of misconduct, the Faculty member will refer the case to the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs using the Graduate Academic Misconduct Referral Form. The referral form must include the
student’s name and student identification number, the name of the class in which the act took place, the date or time period in which the act occurred, a description of the academic misconduct, a summary of actions taken, all original documentation supporting the charge (including a copy of the course syllabus and other written communication that addresses academic integrity standards and expectations for the course) and the academic actions and disciplinary sanctions recommended by the Faculty member. Faculty members are advised to consult with the Graduate Advisor for the student’s program and with the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs prior to recommending sanctions.

The Faculty member also will evaluate the disputed assignment or examination on its merits and note the grade to be assigned in the event that the student is not found responsible for violation of the University of California Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline or where insufficient evidence exists to hold the student responsible.

Upon receipt of the Academic Misconduct Referral Form, the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs will notify the student of the University of California Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline that was allegedly violated, the factual basis for the charges, and the plan to conduct an Initial [Administrative] Review of the case. The student will be advised that the Initial [Administrative] Review is intended as a thorough exposition of all related facts and written materials associated with the alleged misconduct, and that it is not intended as an adversarial criminal or civil legal proceeding. The student will also be informed of his or her right to be assisted by an advisor of his or her choice. Such written notification will occur within 20 calendar days of the receipt of the referral by the Associate Dean and will be sent to the student’s University e-mail address.

A student may not avoid the imposition of a sanction by withdrawing from a course. A student officially notified of alleged academic misconduct may not withdraw from the course until the determination of responsibility is made and any sanctions are imposed. A sanction for a violation of academic integrity that affects the course grade will
be applied. If the student is found not responsible for academic misconduct, the student will be permitted to withdraw from the course in accordance with campus regulations.

4.2 Review Stage 1: Initial [Administrative] Review

The Initial [Administrative] Review, conducted by the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs, involves meetings with the student, the Faculty member, and others who may have relevant information. The student will have the opportunity to discuss any extenuating circumstances, causes, and motivations that may have contributed to the alleged misconduct. If the Associate Dean deems it necessary, a joint meeting will be scheduled at a time when both the Faculty member and the student can attend. If the Faculty member is unavailable for a timely Initial [Administrative] Review, the immediate supervising administrator will be asked to serve in place of the Faculty member.

4.2.1 Outcome of the Initial [Administrative] Review

If the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs determines that it is more likely than not that the student is responsible for academic misconduct, the academic actions recommended by the Faculty member, as well as any disciplinary sanctions imposed by the University, will be assigned.

The determination shall be forwarded by the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs in writing to the student within 20 calendar days of the Initial [Administrative] Review; notice will be sent to the student’s University e-mail address and communicated to the Faculty member and to the dean of the college/school in accordance with legitimate educational interest criteria as articulated by the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act. In cases where the Faculty member has held a grade in abeyance pending the outcome of an Initial [Administrative] Review, he or she shall submit a final grade to the Registrar that is consistent with the determination by the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs as to the question of misconduct. Either the student or faculty member
can appeal the decision of the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs.

Cases involving a student with a record of previous academic misconduct or cases that are sufficiently complex to require additional consultation shall be referred directly by the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs for a Stage 2 review by the Graduate Academic Integrity Committee for a formal hearing.

4.3 Review Stage 2: Complex Cases and Appeals from Stage 1

Review Stage 2 is reserved for cases involving a student with a record of previous academic misconduct or cases that are sufficiently complex or egregious to require additional consultation by the Graduate Academic Integrity Committee [GAIC] for a formal hearing. Review Stage 2 also serves as the stage for appeals of decisions made at Review Stage 1. Appellate decisions at Review Stage 2 are final.

The Academic Senate’s Committee on Committees will appoint faculty to the Graduate Academic Integrity Committee to serve one-year terms, effective September 1-August 31, and will appoint one faculty member from the GAIC to serve as chair. The GAIC will consist of at least one member from each school and at least two members from each college and should include faculty who are available to participate in hearing during the summer months.

In addition, the Graduate Division will solicit and review applications from interested graduate students and make recommendations to the Graduate Student Association of UCR regarding students to be appointed to serve on the GAIC for one-year terms, effective September 1-August 31. The final endorsement of student members will rest with the Committee on Committees. Students are not eligible to serve if they have been suspended or are on academic or disciplinary probation, have been evicted from University Housing for reasons related to conduct, or have a case pending before the Graduate Division, GAIC, or Graduate Council.

Faculty and student members should represent the disciplinary diversity within each college/school.
whenever possible. Staff support to the committee will be provided by the Graduate Division.

4.3.1 Hearing Panels

For each Stage 2 case, the chair of the GAIC will schedule a hearing panel of three to five GAIC members. A quorum is required for a hearing to proceed and consists of three persons, including at least one faculty member and one student.

The Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs or designee will serve as a non-voting member of the hearing panel. The chair of the hearing panel shall rule on all questions of procedure and evidence, including but not limited to: the order of presentation of evidence, admissibility of evidence, applicability of regulations to a particular case, and relevance of testimony.

4.3.2 Hearing Procedures

1. Preparation: Prior to the hearing, panel members will receive and review a copy of the notification of charges and documentary evidence provided by the Faculty member, the University, and the student.

2. Introductory comments: At the beginning of the hearing, the chair will ask any panel members to disqualify themselves from participation if they believe that they cannot render a just and fair decision, and will permit the student to request that a member be disqualified if the student believes for an appropriate reason that a panel member cannot render a just and fair decision. If a student or Faculty member of the hearing panel is disqualified, another member will be appointed to fill the same role, if needed for a quorum. The chair will read aloud the charges of academic misconduct, and the student will be asked to respond to the charges by (a) accepting responsibility, (b) accepting
responsibility and noting that there are mitigating circumstances, or (c) denying responsibility for the alleged violation of the University of California Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline.

3. Presentation of accounts: The Faculty member and the student will be given the opportunity to present their accounts of the incident and to present any witnesses or other individuals who may have relevant information about the alleged academic misconduct. Hearing panel members will be given an opportunity to ask questions of the Faculty member, the student, and witnesses. Each party will then be asked if there is additional information needed, or if any discrepancies or questions need to be presented or addressed.

4. Deliberation: The hearing panel will deliberate in private to decide, by a majority vote, if a preponderance of the evidence indicates that the student is responsible or not responsible for alleged violation of University of California Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline.

5. Determination of sanctions: If the student is found to be responsible for violations of policies, the hearing panel shall be informed of the student’s prior record of academic misconduct. Based on this information and the recommendation of the faculty member, the committee will determine the disciplinary sanctions to be assigned, how and for how long the record of the sanctions will be maintained on the student’s permanent record, and the conditions that must be met for the record to be removed, if any.
6. Notification of decision: Once the hearing panel has reached a decision, the parties will reassemble, and the results of the deliberation will be presented. Within 20 calendar days, the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs will send written notification to the student, the Faculty member, and the dean or his/her designated associate dean for student academic affairs of the college/school detailing the decision and the sanctions imposed by the hearing panel. The notification will also outline the appeal process.

7. Records: An audio recording of the hearing, but not the deliberations of the hearing panel, shall be made and retained by the Graduate Division as part of the record for as long as the disciplinary record is retained, or for seven years from the date of decision, whichever is shorter (see Section 6 below). The student may obtain a copy of the recording upon paying the expense of making such copy. Either party may arrange for a stenographer to make a full transcript of the proceedings at his/her own expense. If one party has the proceedings transcribed, arrangements shall be made before the hearing as to how to apportion the cost if both parties want copies. Other than for the purpose of the official record as provided above, mechanical or electronic devices for recording or broadcasting shall be excluded from the hearing.

4.4 Review Stage 3: Appeals from Stage 2 and Annual Assessment of Cases

Review Stage 3 is reserved for appeals of primary decisions made at Review Stage 2, and for annual assessment of cases adjudicated at Review Stages 1 and 2. For each Stage 3 case, the Chair of the
Graduate Council or designee shall select a 3-5 member subcommittee of the Graduate Council to serve as an appeal panel. Each Stage 3 hearing will be conducted according to the Hearing Procedures described above in Section 4.3.2.

The Graduate Council additionally conducts annual assessments of cases adjudicated at Review Stages 1 and 2 for the purpose of providing oversight and ensuring that policies and procedures are appropriately and consistently applied.

5. Appeals

Decisions of the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs may be appealed to the GAIC. Appellate decisions by the GAIC are final. Primary decisions of the GAIC may be appealed to the Graduate Council. Appellate decisions by the Graduate Council are final. In any decision that includes a sanction of dismissal of a graduate student, the Dean of the Graduate Division will be the final arbiter.

5.1 Criteria for Appeals

Appeals must be based on one or more of the following:

- New evidence not reasonably available at the time of the original hearing, the absence of which can be shown to have had a detrimental impact on the outcome of the hearing
- Procedural error that can be shown to have had a detrimental impact on the outcome of the hearing
- Errors in the interpretation of University policy so substantial as to deny one of the parties a fair hearing
- Grossly inappropriate sanction having no reasonable relationship to the charges

5.2 Appeal Procedures

1. The Faculty member or the student may appeal a decision in writing to the appropriate body for appeal, as described above. The appeal must be made within 10 calendar days after the written decision is made available.
2. Appeals must be authored and signed by the submitting party. Appeals produced by advisors or other non-parties will not be considered.

3. The filing of a timely appeal suspends the imposition of sanctions until the appeal is decided. Grades or degrees will be withheld pending conclusion of the appeal.

4. When an appeal has been filed, the relevant parties may be requested to respond in writing to the matters in question before a decision about the appeal is made. The non-appealing party, whether student or Faculty member, will be notified of the appeal within 10 calendar days and will be given an opportunity to submit a written statement for consideration within 20 calendar days.

5. The appellate body will determine whether the grounds for appeal have been satisfied and whether further process is necessary to resolve the appeal. Findings of fact will be accepted as determined by the original adjudicating body, unless the appellate body determines that the original adjudicating body acted in an arbitrary, capricious, or unfair manner.

6. The appellate body will make a decision based on the written submissions within 20 calendar days, or indicate in writing what further process is necessary for final resolution.

7. The appellate body may approve, reject, or modify the decision and sanction in question. The action taken shall be communicated in writing to the student, the Faculty member, and the original adjudicating body within 20
calendar days after receipt of the appeal and related documents. The decision of the appellate body is final.

6. Maintenance of Records

Graduate Division shall serve as the central location where all written, audio, and electronic records of incidents of academic misconduct are kept on file. The records will be readily available for review by the Deans and Associate Deans of each College or School, the Dean of the Graduate Division, the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, and the Vice Provost for Conflict Resolution, in accordance with legitimate educational interest criteria as articulated by the Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act.

The file of a student found in violation of campus regulations (including the transcripts or recordings of the hearing) will be maintained for a period of at least seven years from the date of the letter providing notice of final disciplinary action, unless otherwise determined by the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs. When a student is suspended as a result of a violation of the University of California Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline, the fact that suspension was imposed must be posted on the academic transcript for the duration of the suspension. When a student is dismissed, the fact that dismissal was imposed must be posted on the academic transcript permanently.

Comparing Undergraduate and Graduate Procedures

The table below shows the steps in the investigation and review of incidents covered here. The steps are the same for undergraduate students and graduate students, with the exception that different investigation bodies will participate in the reviews.
JUSTIFICATION:

The proposed changes to the policy on academic integrity will:

- move responsibility for adjudication of alleged academic misconduct by graduate students from the Academic Integrity Committees of the Colleges and Schools to the Graduate Division and Graduate Council. Enabling changes have been made to the undergraduate portion of the document to indicate separate processes for undergraduate and graduate academic misconduct investigations and hearings. The rationales for these changes are as follows:

(a) The current process for Graduate students is sometimes varied as it is not clearly detailed, and the penalties are not always consistent or appropriate. The revised policy introduces an academic integrity policy designed specifically for graduate students.

(b) Graduate students should be held to different (higher) standards than undergraduate students, but we have seen graduate cases adjudicated in ways that seem excessively lenient. By separating graduate from undergraduate cases, both hearing processes will produce outcomes that are more appropriate for and consistent within their respective constituencies.

(c) The current process seriously limits the ability of the Graduate Dean and Graduate Council to oversee graduate academic integrity. Currently, the Graduate Dean may only modify a conduct decision if it is a recommendation for dismissal and the Graduate Council has no role. Because very few cases result in recommendations for dismissal, the currently policy has effectively moved a very important aspect of graduate academic affairs out of the Graduate Dean’s office. The proposed policy moves responsibility to the Graduate Dean’s office, makes the Graduate Council the final appellate body, and gives the Graduate Council oversight of the process through the annual review of cases.

(d) There have been instances in the past where graduate student cases were heard by committees comprised of faculty and undergraduate students, apparently because graduate students were unavailable for the hearing. Although this has not happened very often, we think it is inappropriate. The proposed policy eliminates such situations.

(e) Student Conduct has a large caseload of mostly undergraduate cases. Although they work hard to adjudicate cases efficiently, both undergraduate and graduate cases could be adjudicated more efficiently by off-loading the graduate caseload and allowing them to focus on the undergraduate cases.

- add definitions of student academic misconduct to the body of the policy. These are currently provided in an auxiliary document. These proposed changes highlight the definitions for students.

- tie deadlines for actions and reporting at various stages in resolution of academic integrity cases to calendar days rather than business days, which will clarify deadlines and ease their calculation. Often these changes also extend the number of days allowed (e.g., a change from 15 business days to 20 calendar days). The longer timeframe is required to allow for follow up communications or interviews that may need to occur with the student (s) involved, course faculty and possible witnesses, depending on the complexity of the case. A similar change was made for non-academic cases several years ago based on an Audit & Advisory Services review and recommendation that our policy accurately reflect our practice.

- clarify that the policy refers to academic integrity issues arising among students. Faculty academic integrity issues are addressed elsewhere, including the UCR Office of Research Policy.
and Procedures for Responding To Allegations of Research Misconduct (Policy#: 529-900), Appendix 5 to the Bylaws and Regulations of the Riverside Division (i.e., APM-015 and APM-016), and APM-190 Appendix B.

- strengthen the articulation of the appeal process to ensure that only the faculty-led Campus Academic Integrity Executive Committee may modify the decisions of the School or College Academic Integrity Committees.
- update the names of relevant administrative units, including the Office of Student Conduct and Academic Integrity Programs (formerly Student Judicial Affairs) and the Vice Provost for Administrative Resolution (formerly the Vice Provost for Conflict Resolution). Revisions reflect technological changes at the University, primarily the expanded use of e-mail and digital audio recording in lieu of mail delivered by post or audio tape.
- provide readers with more subject headings to clarify the process of review.

The original policy was developed by Committee on Educational Policy in active consultation with the Assistant Vice Chancellor & Dean of Students and Director of Student Conduct. These Student Affairs colleagues are interested and available to participate in discussion of proposed revision.

**APPROVALS:**
Approved by the Executive Committee of CHASS: **4/27/2012**
Approved by the Executive Committee of CNAS:
Approved by the Executive Committee of COE: **4/25/2012**
Approved by the Executive Committee of SoBA: **4/29/2012**
Approved by the Executive Committee of the GSOE: **5/4/2012**
Approved by Graduate Council: **3/26/2012**
Approved by the Committee on Educational Policy: **4/02/12**
The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording to be consistent with the code of the Academic Senate: **4/19/2012**
Received by the Executive Council: **5/14/2012**
Sources for definitions

Cheating; UCB, http://campuslife.berkeley.edu/conduct/integrity/definition

Fabrication; From research policy http://or.ucr.edu/about/policies-ucr.aspx Effective 11/1/06, and current UCR definitions document

Plagiarism; From research policy http://or.ucr.edu/about/policies-ucr.aspx

Facilitating; UCSC, http://undergraduate.ucsc.edu/acad_integrity/definitions.html


Interference; compiled from current UCR definitions document

Failure to comply; current UCR definitions document

Retaliation; current UCR definitions document
To: Mary Gauvain, Chair
    Academic Senate

From: Kambiz Vafai, Chair
    Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction

Re: Academic Integrity Policy Revision Proposal

Per your email question (attached), the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction has determined that based on Bylaw 9.1, the approval by a college Executive Committee is not necessary for the Academic Integrity policy. That is, the Executive Committee may be consulted, and its opinion reported to the Division, but the Executive Committee of a college does not need to approve the policy.