January 19, 2012

TO: Ameae M. Walker (Biomedical Sciences), Vice Chair
    Daniel Ozer (Psychology), Secretary/Parliamentarian
    Kenneth Barish (Physics and Astronomy), Graduate Council
    Paulo Chagas (Music), Academic Computing & Information Technology
    Steven Clark (Psychology), Undergraduate Admissions
    Walter Clark, (Music), Academic Personnel (CAP)
    Kevin Esterling (Political Science), CHASS Executive Committee
    Jay Farrell (Electrical Engineering), BCOE Executive Committee
    John Ganim (English), Physical Resources Planning (PRP)
    Jang-Ting Guo (Economics), Committee on Committees (COC)
    Irving Hendrick (GSOE), Faculty Welfare (FW)
    Jodie S. Holt (Botany and Plant Sciences), Junior Representative to the Assembly
    Martin Johnson (Political Science), Educational Policy (CEP)
    Bronwyn Leebaw (Political Science), Preparatory Education
    Umar Mohideen (Physics and Astronomy), Planning and Budget (P&B)
    Thomas Morton (Chemistry), Senior Assembly Representative
    Leonard Nunney (Biology), Committee on Research (COR)
    Michael J. Orosco (GSOE), Diversity & Equal Opportunity (CODEO)
    David R. Parker (Environmental Sciences), CNAS Executive Committee
    Melanie Sperling (GSOE), GSOE Executive Committee
    Daniel S. Straus (Biomedical Sciences), Biomed Executive Committee
    Rami Zwick (SoBA), SoBA Executive Committee

FR: Mary Gauvain, Chair
    Riverside Division

RE: Executive Council Agenda, January 23, 2012

This is to confirm the meeting of the Executive Council on Monday, January 23, 2012 at 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. in Room 220, Floor, University Office Building.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Enclosures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>1 (pp. 1-8)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
II. **PRESENTATION BY CHANCELLOR T. WHITE**

1:10 – 1:45

III. **ANNOUNCEMENTS BY CHAIR GAUVAIN:**

1:45 – 2:15

Academic Integrity Policy – Next Step

2:15 – 2:20

IV. **BYLAWS OF THE SCHOOL OF MEDICINE**

2:20 – 2:50

To be received by EC

2:50 – 3:00

V. **DISCUSSION REGARDING iEval**

VI. **DEFINING ACADEMIC FREEDOM**

Tom Morton will lead discussion
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING
MINUTES
JANUARY 9, 2012

PRESENT:
Ameae M. Walker (Biomedical Sciences), Vice Chair
Daniel Ozer (Psychology), Secretary/Parliamentarian
Kenneth Barish (Physics), Graduate Council
Steven Clark (Psychology), Undergraduate Admissions
Walter Clark (Music) Academic Personnel
Kevin Esterling (Political Science), CHASS Executive Committee
Jay Farrell (Electrical Engineering), BCOE Executive Committee
John Ganim (English), Physical Resources Planning (PRP)
Mary Gauvain (Psychology), Chair
Jang-Ting Guo (Economics), Committee on Committees (COC)
Irving Hendrick (GSOE), Faculty Welfare (FW)
Martin Johnson (Political Science), Educational Policy (CEP)
Bronwyn Leebaw (Political Science), Preparatory Education
Umar Mohideen (Physics), Planning and Budget (P&B)
Thomas Morton (Chemistry), Senior Assembly Representative
Michael J. Orosco (GSOE), Diversity & Equal Opportunity (CODEO)
David R. Parker (Environmental Sciences), CNAS Executive Committee
Melanie Sperling (GSOE), GSOE Executive Committee
Daniel S. Straus (Biomedical Sciences), Biomed Executive Committee
Rami Zwick (SoBA), SoBA Executive Committee

ABSENT:
Paulo Chagas (Music), Academic Computing & Information Technology
Jodie S. Holt (Botany and Plant Sciences), Jr. Rep to the Assembly
Leonard Nunney (Biology), Committee on Research (COR)

GUESTS:
Dallas Rabenstein, Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost
Leo Schouest, Manager Faculty & Student Technical Support
Israel Fletes, Director of Educational Technology and Computing Services

AGENDA:
The agenda and minutes were approved as written.

The Conflict of Interest Statements of the Senate Committees were noted as received.
**Presentation by EVCP Dallas Rabenstein:**

EVCP Rabenstein presented the following updates to the EC:

**Budget:** In FY11-12, the UC had a $650 million budget reduction of which UCR’s share was $47.4 million. Later in the year, there was an additional cut of $100 million, which brought the total for UC for FY11-12 to $750 million. The Office of the President decided to fund the extra $100 million reduction centrally (at UCOP) for this year. EVCP Rabenstein indicated that the Governor’s budget for FY12-13 includes a budget cut of 7.5 million for UCR. Included in the Governor’s budget is $90 million, which is to help fund the employer’s contribution to the UC retirement plan for FY12-13. The funding is not enough to cover the costs completely and the language used in the Governor’s budget states that the funds “can be used to address costs related to retirement program contributions.” Thus, this allocation is not a line item of funding for UCRP. EVCP Rabenstein indicated that this is a problem because there is no guarantee these funds will continue in the following year, and furthermore there is no guarantee that if the State continues to provide some UCRP funding, that the level of funding will increase so that it will eventually cover the real costs. The funds will not be enough to cover the costs and there is no indication that the State is assuming responsibility for covering the costs. In terms of real dollars, the UC employer contribution is 5.7%, which comes to about $8.8 million for UCR. In FY12-13, the cost is about 8.8%, which translates to about $13.6 million for UCR; and for FY13-14 the cost will grow to 10.8%, which is about $16.7 million for UCR. EVCP Rabenstein indicated that this will place a huge financial burden on the campus.

In the Governor’s budget for FY12-13, there is another trigger that if pulled will result in an additional $200m budget reduction to the UC. The trigger is related to whether or not the Governor’s proposed revenue initiative fails. If the revenue initiative fails, it will result in about $15 million in cuts to UCR. In addition, the Governor’s budget proposes changes to the Cal Grants; in particular, it proposes increasing the GPA requirements for Cal Grants. There are two types of Cal Grants and the proposal is to raise one from 3.0 to 3.25 and the other one will be raised from 2.0 to 2.7. We have a very large percentage of students who receive Cal Grants and there is a possibility that this will negatively affect our students. EVCP Rabenstein also pointed out that the UC general fund budget in 2007-8 was $3.25 billion dollars. In FY11-12, the general budget is $2.27 million, which is about a 30% reduction in the general funds budget. In addition to the cuts, UCR also has a number of unfunded mandates, which includes faculty merits and promotion, and the 3% merit increase for faculty and staff and the employee benefit costs. This means therefore, that next year, UCR will be running in the negative.

**Rebenching:** EVCP Rabenstein indicated that the Rebenching Committee is still working on finding a solution and pointed out that the campuses that are overfunded are UCLA, UC Davis and UC Merced; he added that UCM is in a special category because it is a growing campus. UCB is slightly overfunded and UCR, UCSD, UCSC, UCSB and UCI are all underfunded relative to the average. There is a lot of effort underway in systemwide discussions to address this issue.
CNAS Dean Appointment: On November 22nd, the Chancellor and the EVCP sent out an email indicating that Dean Baldwin was stepping down and in that email requested for nominations and applications for an interim dean appointment. He received 16 nominations for the position, and after consultation with all the CNAS department Chairs, the Associate Deans, Directors of Interdepartmental Programs and Centers, he appointed Prof. Marilynn Yates as the Dean of CNAS. He later found out that he had not followed protocol in that the position was recruited as an interim position but the appointment was not interim. EVCP Rabenstein mentioned that he has sent out an email to the CNAS faculty requesting nominations for an interim search for a dean with a 3.5-year term appointment. He has also asked the Committee on Committees to provide a slate of names for a search committee. He indicated that due to the upcoming redesign of the CNAS, it would not be wise to recruit a dean midway through a redesign process. It was important to have one person in place to undertake the redesign and see it all the way through.

Redesign of CNAS: EVCP Rabenstein indicated that during the development of the UCR 2020 strategic plan, it became obvious that there was a need to reorganize CNAS. It is important to determine if CNAS is aligned with 21st century science. His office together with the CNAS Dean’s office will be facilitating the process, but the content and the intellectual work will be done by the faculty. The process will involve Town Hall meetings with CNAS faculty, and there are also plans to bring in people from NSF, NIH, and DOE to talk about where they see science going.

One of the other issues that came out during the Strategic Planning process was the question of whether UCR needs an Honors College or whether UCR should expand the existing Honors Program. EVCP Rabenstein mentioned that this would give us leverage in recruiting more of the best and the brightest students. He will be putting together a taskforce to look at this issue.

Finally, he discussed the protest guidelines and indicated that they should not have been released and have now been withdrawn. The Chancellor has appointed a taskforce to deal with this matter on our campus.

Blended Learning: Leo Schouest, Manager Faculty & Student Technical Support and Israel Fletes, Director of Educational Technology and Computing Services from Computing and Communications (C&C) provided an update to the EC relating to Blending Learning and emerging technologies that will impact UCR in the years ahead. The C&C team discussed blended learning, describing how with this method, the expectation is that 50% of faculty instructional time will be spent on face-to-face interactions with students, and 50% will occur through webinars. Faculty are already using iLearn (blogs, wikis, online assessment, etc.), Pod Casts, classroom capture and webinars (e.g. Adobe Connect). However, one area that has not been discussed is how C&C should move forward. The EC members informed the C&C team that the authority over curriculum lies with the Senate and that any change that involves the curriculum and how it is delivered should be discussed with the Committee on Educational Policy, and Committee on Courses. EC members raised the issue of contact hours and how this would be determined as well as intellectual property issues. Leo Schouest indicated that there is no policy that guides blended learning and that
all the faculty participate as volunteers. The EC members agreed that there needs to be more interaction between C&C, CEP, and the Committee on Courses and that a policy needs to be formalized that will guide the creation of these courses and any other such courses in the future.

**ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR:**
Chair Gauvain introduced the new Chair of CAP Prof. Walter Clark, from the Music Department who replaced Prof. Marylynn Yates. Chair Gauvain indicated that she wanted to discuss the following issues:

**COSA - Committee on Sales for Service Activity:** Chair Gauvain indicated that COSSA is a committee whose functions are to provide services and goods on campus at rates that are reasonable and equitable to the faculty. The Office of Academic Planning and Budget (AP&B), as part of its role as the Campus's budget office, is charged with the responsibility of applying this policy and the committee is made up of staff from APB and faculty members. In the past, the request for faculty members was addressed by CoC but it has become apparent that in order to serve the faculty's best interest, it would be better to change the Bylaws of the Committee on Planning and Budget to include a statement that two members of P&B, one of whom could be the Chair, would serve on COSSA. This proposal will be circulated for approval by the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction as well as Planning and Budget before presentation at the February Division meeting.

**iEval:** Chair Gauvain also indicated that it has become apparent that there needs to be discussion about iEval because students are being offered incentives in an attempt to get them to complete the evaluation of their professor. This happened despite the fact that the Senate had requested that there should be no incentives offered. Chair Gauvain indicated that she brought this issue to the attention of the EC members to see if they want to discuss it in more details at another meeting and also if they would like to invite VPUE Steven Brint to come and address the incentives issue with the EC. It was mentioned that anything that impinges on the curriculum should be ratified through the divisional meeting. After some further discussion, the EC agreed that this item would be added to the next agenda for further discussion.

**Senate Chair Election:** Chair Gauvain indicated that she was not going to run again for Chair of the Senate and wanted to encourage the EC members to think about people who would be interested in running. She stated that she was open to meeting and discussing with interested faculty what being the Chair of the Senate entails.

Chair Gauvain indicated that about the protests guidelines issue were posted on the campus website by the Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs and they had not been seen by the Chancellor prior to the posting. The Chancellor has assumed leadership in response to the crisis. The Chancellor has since created a UCR Task Force on Speech and Assembly and the first meeting of the taskforce was held on Friday the 6th. The meeting was attended by about 20 students who added to the the discussions. There is also an inquiry that is being chaired by Chris Edley, who is the Honorable William H. Orrick, Jr. Distinguished Chair and
Dean of the UC Berkeley School of Law, and Charles Robinson, Vice President and General Counsel of the University of California Chief UC Counsel.

Finally, Chair Gauvain mentioned that the Regents will be meeting at UCR on January 18 and 19, 2012.

**OTHER EXECUTIVE COUNCIL & COMMITTEE BUSINESS:**

Bronwyn Leebaw (Political Science), Chair of Preparatory Education

- Preparatory Education is discussing a proposal from VPUE Steven Brint about charging students for remedial classes, which would involve re-designating the classes from preparatory to remedial. The committee was not enthusiastic about that proposal. The next step is more research on specific budget figures regarding that proposal and also looking at other ways to save money, and looking at admissions as a way to deal with the cost of remedial education.

Melanie Sperling, (GSOE), GSOE Chair, Executive Committee

- Prof. Sperling commented that it was absolutely critical to have a policy in place with regards to blended learning.

Tom Morton (Chemistry), Senior Assembly Representative

- Indicated that guidelines for campus protests should be addressed by an independent group, separate from the Task force that has been formed by the Chancellor.

Steve Clark (Psychology), Chair of Undergraduate Admissions Committee (UGA)

- Prof. Clark mentioned that the freshmen numbers are up and the transfers were down by about 4.5% and they are not sure why. He mentioned non-residential applications are up by approximately 30%. He also mentioned that BOARS sent two resolutions to the President regarding non-resident applications in an attempt to ensure that campuses continue to meet BOARS’ “compare favorably” rule and also to compel a measure of accountability by asking campuses to report annually to BOARS on their implementation of the rule.

Jay Farrell (Electrical Engineering), Chair, BCOE Executive Committee

- BCOE is dealing with retention issues as well as trying to develop some tools for enrollment and course planning.

David Parker (Environmental Sciences), Chair, CNAS Executive Committee

- Professor Parker informed the EC that the County of Los Angeles has filed felony charges against the faculty and UCLA campus related to a laboratory fire that resulted in the death of a laboratory worker. He indicated that UCR has cut substantially the oversight of EH&S and the faculty are now being required to inspect their own laboratories as there is nobody available from EH&S to fulfill this function. This is an issue of concern to faculty in CNAS.
Umar Mohideen (Physics), Chair of Planning and Budget (P&B)
- P&B is continuing discussions about rebenching and funding streams.

Jang-Ting Guo (Economics), Committee on Committees (CoC)
- CoC will be meeting on Friday to discuss the vacancy in CAP created by the appointment of Prof. Marylynn Yates as interim Dean of CNAS and also discuss the online survey form for faculty appointments for next year.

Ken Barish (Physics), Graduate Council (GC)
- Graduate Council discussed the Academic Integrity issue and approved it. There is a systemwide taskforce regarding student support going on. Prof. Robert Clare from Physics is a member of that Taskforce.

Meeting adjourned at 2:45 PM.

Respectfully submitted,

Selbyna Ehlers
Executive Director
Office of the Academic Senate
Hi Sellyna,

As of today, I have response from majority of GSOE Executive Committee. We approve the proposed changes to Academic Integrity Policy at UCR.

Best,
Melanie

---

Dear All:

Attached, please find a memo from Chair Gauvain for your committee to review.

Thanks.

S

---

Executive Director
Academic Senate
University of California
Riverside, CA 92521
Tel: 951-827-2544
Fax: 951-827-5545
Email: mailto:sellyna.ehlers@ucr.edu
     senate.ucr.edu

Failure is not getting knocked down; it is not getting up again! Mohammed Ali aka Cassius Clay
From: Rami Zwick <ramiz@ucr.edu>
Sent: Friday, December 16, 2011 9:29 AM
To: Sellyna Ehlers
Cc: Rami Zwick
Subject: Re: Proposed Changes to Academic Integrity Policy at UCR

Dear Professor Gauvain:

SoBA EC discussed the Proposed Changes to the Academic Integrity Policy at UCR in our e-Meetings on December 3 to 5, 2011 and we support the proposed changes.

Sincerely,

Rami Zwick
Chair, SoBA Executive Committee

Sellyna Ehlers wrote:
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>
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>
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>
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>
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>
> University of California
>
> Riverside, CA 92521
>
> Tel: 951-827-2544
>
> Fax: 951-827-5545
>
> Email: mailto:sellyna.ehlers@ucr.edu
>
> senate.ucr.edu
>
> Failure is not getting knocked down; it is not getting up again!
> Mohammed Ali aka Cassius Clay**
Date: January 11, 2011

To: Mary Gauvain  
Chair of the Academic Senate  
University of California, Riverside

From: Jay A. Farrell  
Chair of the Faculty  
Bourns College of Engineering  
University of California, Riverside

RE: Changes to Academic Integrity Policy

The BCOE Executive Committee reviewed the proposed changes to the UCR Academic Integrity policy yesterday at its meeting.

We want to be clear that we greatly appreciate the efforts of the persons involved with re-writing the policy and clarifying procedures. It must have required considerable time and dedication. We are supportive of the effort and have not identified any deficiencies in the revised procedures; however, the two column format made the review difficult and we are not completely certain of our final analysis. Therefore, in the end we did not formally vote on the matter.

Perhaps, in a situation like this where essentially the entire document has been revised, the two column format is not the best mode of presentation.
Hi Sellyna,

The CHASS Executive Committee approved the proposed changes to the Academic Integrity Proposal. I did not notice an approval area for all faculty in CHASS, so I did not have a faculty meeting. Do you need me to have a faculty meeting to approve this, or is Executive Committee approval all that is needed in this case? Thanks.

Gabrielle
January 17, 2012

TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FM: KENNETH N. BARISH, CHAIR
GRADUATE COUNCIL

RE: ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY

The Graduate Council at its December 8, 2011 meeting discussed the newly revised Academic Integrity policy. The proposed policy represents significant changes for graduate students. The Graduate Council and Graduate Division have pointed out issues with the current policy for some time and the revised policy takes these into account. We urge for the policy, with a few revisions as noted below, to be implemented as soon as possible.

The Graduate Council discussed the following issues with the current policy:

- 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. We suspect this is due to the “anchoring effect” created by the vast majority of conduct cases being undergraduate cases. By separating graduate from undergraduate cases, we believe both hearing processes will produce outcomes that are more appropriate for and consistent within their respective constituencies.

- The current process seriously limits the ability of the Graduate Dean (and ultimately the Graduate Council) to oversee graduate academic integrity. The current process requires that the Graduate Dean accept any conduct decision unless it is a recommendation for dismissal. Only in cases involving dismissal
may the Graduate Dean decide to modify the conduct decision. 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.

- 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. With more control over the process, the Graduate Division will be able to avoid such situations.

- 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.

The Graduate Council reviewed at least two previous iterations of this policy change, and there was consensus that the proposed policy addresses these issues as well as other suggestions which were previously made.

The Graduate Council discussed a few additional concerns, which are addressed with the following changes to the proposed policy and included in the attached revised policy:

- **Allegations of Misconduct in Research:** All allegations of research misconduct should be immediately reported to the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs. 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, Vice Chancellor for Research who serves as the UCR Research Integrity Officer.

- 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.
• In cases where the Faculty member has held a grade in abeyance pending the outcome of an Initial Review, he or she shall submit a final grade with to the Registrar that is consistent with the determination by SCAIP [or Graduate Division for graduate students] as to the question of misconduct.

• 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 with a grade of "W".

1. Hearing Panels

• For cases involving undergraduate students, SCAIP, will schedule a hearing panel of three to five members, from the relevant AIC for each case. For cases involving graduate students, the Associate Dean of the Graduate Division, in consultation with the chair of the GAIC, the Associate Dean or designee will serve as a non-voting administrative chair of the hearing panel 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.

• For Undergraduates, the Vice Provost for Administrative Resolution or his/her designee will serve as a non-voting, administrative chair of the hearing panel to facilitate the hearing. For graduate students, the Associate Dean or designee will serve as a non-voting administrative chair 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.

• 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 Vice Provost for Administrative Resolution or designee for undergraduates, and Associate Dean of the Graduate Division for graduate students, will send written notification

The Graduate Council unanimously agreed to endorse the policy with the modifications above.
January 17, 2012

TO: MARY GAUVAIN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FM: MARTIN JOHNSON, CHAIR
EDUCATIONAL POLICY

RE: REVIEW OF PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE POLICY ON ACADEMIC INTEGRITY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, RIVERSIDE

The Committee on Educational Policy of the Riverside Division discussed proposed revisions of the Academic Integrity policy at its January 11 meeting. The committee invited Assistant Vice Chancellor and Dean of Students Susan Allen Ortega and Student Conduct & Academic Integrity Programs (SCAIP) Director Laura Riley to the meeting to discuss the substance and presentation of these proposed changes.

Per our conversation at the meeting, the intent of the proposed changes focus on two issues: the recruitment of members for Academic Integrity Committee (AIC) hearing panels, especially those held during the summer, and the removal of graduate student academic integrity reviews from the SCAIP office to Graduate Division, to be overseen by the Dean of the Graduate Division.

Members of the Committee on Educational Policy expressed no objections to these proposed changes. However, the Committee has requested that AVC/Dean of Students revert the proposal original language of the current Academic Integrity Policy and make changes to that only as necessary to implement the proposed substantive proposals.

These two substantive proposals represent only a portion of the extensive alterations that have been made to the current Academic Integrity Policy (approved by CEP June 15, 2005). At some point in the multi-year deliberations over these proposed changes, well-intentioned colleagues have re-written the Academic Integrity Policy in the interest of providing a clearer statement of policy for the Division. However, as a result, the side-by-side document transmitted November 30, 2011, which attempts to show the proposed changes next to the existing text is
difficult to follow. An adequate comparison of the prior and proposed policies is not possible in many sections of this document. Consequently, while members of the committee express no objections to the intended proposals, many are concerned about the unintended consequences of these revisions.

While making a good faith effort to review the proposed, re-written Academic Integrity Policy, members of the committee found that the previous policy represented an adequate starting point for the proposed substantive revisions.

The committee encouraged the AVC/Dean of Students to amend the previous document to make the proposed changes to the section on recruiting members for the AIC hearing panels and to add a section on the treatment of graduate-level academic integrity cases. This simpler approach would make the changes clearer than the broader stylist revision conveys and would allow all reviewing committees to consider these two principal changes on their merit. Amending the previous policy in a more straightforward way would also clarify any concerns about unintended consequences associated with the current proposal’s stylistic revisions.

In addition, members of the committee suggested that the Justification for the proposed changes needs strengthening. The justification should present rationales for moving graduate academic integrity cases to Graduate Division and clarify the importance of the proposed changes to the recruitment of AIC members for summer hearing panels.
TO: Mary Gauvain, Chair
Riverside Division

FROM: David R. Parker
Chair, CNAS Executive Committee

DATE: December 14, 2011

RE: Proposed Changes to Academic Integrity Policy & Procedures

I have reviewed the most recent version of the proposed changes that accompanied your memo of 30 November, 2011. Although the proposal is now in two-column format, I cannot see that any gains in clarity have been realized. The left- and right-hand columns are not aligned in many (or most) places. Although I can follow the gist of the “before” and “after” language for about the first four pages, comprehension becomes impossible starting on page 5. There is an incredible amount of fragmentation of the old language as it is converted to the new. On page 6, the two paragraphs immediately following the “B” have gone missing altogether, yet they address a topic of some significance to the faculty (e.g., undisputed charges). The heading labeled “2” on page 7 implies that there should have been a preceding section headed by a “1”, but there is not. In short, the document is a confusing muddle.

As I noted to you in my memo of 29 April, the proposed changes seem to be substantial and complex. Yet, the only justification provided remains a single sentence promising to “simplify and clarify the policy”. The existing policy in the 2011-12 general catalog occupies some 3.5 pages, and it is not an easy read; the proposed changes would seem, if anything, to exacerbate its shortcomings. I am very unclear as to identity of the “Academic Senate leadership” to which this proposal is attributed (p. 21). I am not aware of any endorsement by any Senate committee, or even an individual member. It seems that such a proposal would fare much better in the approval process if one or more appropriate Senate committees (e.g., Graduate Council, Educational Policy) would take “ownership”, and ensure that the proposal is suitably crafted for general review.

Accordingly, my response to the proposal as received is to decline to present it to the CNAS Executive Committee. Such proposed changes in legislation need to be in a format and condition ready for presentation to the Division, or very nearly so. That is clearly not the case here, as considerably more effort is needed to craft a proposal that can be reviewed on its merits.

c: M. Johnson, Educational Policy
K. Barish, Graduate Council
K. Esterling, CHASS Executive Committee
J. Farrell, BCOE Executive Committee
D. Straus, BMSC Executive Committee
R. Zwick, SoBA Executive Committee
M. Sperling, GSOE Executive Committee
D. Ozer, Secretary-Parliamentarian
December 12, 2011

To: Mary Gauvain, Chair
   Academic Senate

From: Kambiz Vafai, Chair
      Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction

Re: Proposed Changes to Academic Integrity Policy & Procedures

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds no aspect of the proposed changes to be inconsistent with the bylaws and regulations of the Senate.

However, please see below for a few concerns raised by the R&J Committee on an informational basis for Chair Gauvain:

1. The current version of the document is published on the Senate website as "Appendix 6" to the Bylaws and Regulations of the Senate. According to Bylaw 8.21.2.6 appendices such as this are to be posted as directed by the Division, but the document itself does not include a statement of Divisional authority, only approval of CEP in June 2005. If this is a CEP policy it should not be published as an Appendix to Divisional Bylaws on the website; if it is to be an Appendix, then Divisional approval is called for.

2. The justification for the changes is to "simplify and clarify" the policy and to alter the adjudication process for graduate students. All procedural changes should then be just in the handling of graduate students; and other changes largely editorial. It should be noted that the proposed procedural changes are not about the handling of graduate student cases.
**Proposed Changes to**

**Academic Integrity at the University of California, Riverside**

(Approved by Educational Policy on 15 June 2005 after consultation with the Graduate Council)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Of California Policies Applying to Campus Activities, Organizations, and Students, section 100.00 Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline states that &quot;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...:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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. |

| University of California Policies Applying to Campus Activities, Organizations, and Students, Section 100.00 *Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline* states, "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. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROCEDURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| I. 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 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 |

| Requirements and Expectations:  
**Research**  
To foster intellectual honesty with regard to 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 |
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.

### II. 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.

### Allegations of Misconduct in Research

All allegations of research misconduct should be immediately reported to the Vice Chancellor for Research 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 Vice Chancellor for Research who serves as the UCR Research Integrity Officer.

The Vice Chancellor for Research or his/her designee will review the description of the academic misconduct and all documentation supporting the charge. He/she will determine 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.

**Requirements and Expectations: 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.

**Courses**
The table below shows the steps in the investigation and review process. The steps are the same for undergraduate students and graduate students, with the exception that different investigation bodies will participate in the Reviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible Body: Undergraduate Students</th>
<th>Responsible Body: Graduate Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiation of Cases</td>
<td>Faculty member</td>
<td>Faculty member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Faculty member's suspicion of misconduct in a course, communication with</td>
<td>Faculty member</td>
<td>Faculty member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Stage 1</td>
<td>Student Conduct and Academic Integrity Programs [SCAIP]</td>
<td>Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs [Graduate Division]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review Stage 1</strong></td>
<td>• Initial [Administrative] Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Appeals of decisions made at Review Stage 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Hearings for cases that are complex, egregious, and/or repeated cases of misconduct</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review Stage 2</strong></td>
<td>Academic Integrity Committees of each college/school [AICs]</td>
<td>Graduate Academic Integrity Committee [GAIC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hearing panels constituted from the AICs</td>
<td>Hearing panels constituted from the GAIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review Stage 3</strong></td>
<td>Campus Academic Integrity Executive Committee</td>
<td>Graduate Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Annual assessments of cases addressed at Review Stages 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Courses
If a faculty member, teaching assistant, or other instructional personnel suspects that an act of academic misconduct has occurred in a course, s/he 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

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 Vice Provost for Administrative Resolution. If the discovery is made by a 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
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 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 students’ experience or knowledge of principles of academic integrity, the nature of the assignment, and the degree of intentionality and premeditation 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 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 is expected to assign a temporary grade placeholder of Grade Delay “GD” pending the outcome of the review process.
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 you have 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 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.

2. If the Faculty member makes a determination of misconduct based on facts that the accused student disputes:

The Faculty member will refer the case to SCAIP [or Graduate Division for graduate students] using the 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 (to include 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 administrative sanctions recommended by the Faculty member.

The Faculty member is encouraged to evaluate the disputed assignment or examination on its merits and to 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.
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".

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](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
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. Upon receipt of the Academic Misconduct Referral Form, SCAIP [or Graduate Division for graduate students] 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
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.

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 [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 SCAIP [or Graduate Division for graduate students] and will be sent to the student’s University e-mail address.

a. **Initial [Administrative] Review process**: The Initial [Administrative] Review, conducted by SCAIP [or Graduate Division for graduate students], 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 [or Graduate Division for graduate students] 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.

b. **Outcome of the Initial [Administrative] Review**: If SCAIP [or Graduate Division for graduate students] determines that it is **more likely than not** that the student is responsible for academic misconduct,
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

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 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 SCAIP [or Graduate Division for graduate students] in writing to the student within 20 calendar days of the Initial 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 Review, he or she shall submit a final grade with the Registrar that is consistent with the determination by SCAIP [or Graduate Division for graduate students] as to the question of misconduct.

3. **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 [or Graduate Division for graduate students] for a Stage 2 review by the Academic Integrity Committee in the relevant college/school or to the Graduate Academic Integrity Committee for a formal hearing.

4. 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
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, s/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 Colleges and for the Graduate Division/Professional Schools to:

* hear cases referred by Student Judicial Affairs 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 committee on Committees shall appoint 4 BCOE faculty, 4 AGSM faculty, 2 GSOE faculty, 6 CHASS faculty and 6 CNAS faculty to the panels to serve one year terms effective July 1-June 30. 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 all

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 with a grade of "W."

C. Review Stage 2: Academic Integrity Committees and Hearing Panels

Review Stage 2 is reserved for cases involving a student with a record of previous academic misconduct or cases that are sufficiently complex to require additional consultation by the Academic Integrity Committee in the relevant college/school or to the Graduate Academic Integrity Committee for a formal hearing. Review Stage 2 also serves as the stage for appeals of decisions made at Review Stage 1.

1. College/School Academic Integrity Committees for Cases Involving Undergraduate Students

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

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
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)

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.

Faculty and student members should represent the disciplinary diversity within each college/school, whenever possible. Staff support to the committees will be provided by the office of the Vice Provost for Administrative Resolution, the office of the AVC/Dean of Students, and SCAIP.

2. **Graduate Academic Integrity Committee for Cases Involving Graduate Students**

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.
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.

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.

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.

3. Hearing Panels

For cases involving undergraduate students, SCAIP, will schedule a hearing panel of three to five members, from the relevant AIC for each case. For cases involving graduate students, the Associate Dean of the Graduate Division, in consultation with the chair of the GAIC, will schedule a hearing panel of three to five GAIC members. The Associate Dean or designee will serve as a non-voting administrative chair of the hearing panel. A quorum is required for a hearing to proceed and consists of three persons, including at least one faculty member and one student.

For Undergraduates, the Vice Provost for Administrative Resolution or his/her designee will serve as a non-voting, administrative chair of the hearing panel to facilitate the hearing. 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.
The Vice Provost for Conflict Resolution or his/her designee** will serve as a non-voting Chair to facilitate the hearing. The 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:

A. Committee members will receive and review a copy of the notification of charges and documentary evidence provided by the instructor, the University, and the student.

B. The Chair will ask all present at the hearing to introduce themselves for the record. The Chair will invite committee members to disqualify themselves from participation in the hearing if they believe for any reason that they cannot render a just and fair decision and will invite the student to request that a member be disqualified as a result of prior involvement in the case or if the student believes for an appropriate reason that a committee member cannot render a just and fair decision.

C. The charges shall be read aloud and the student shall be asked to respond to the charges by accepting responsibility, accepting responsibility and noting that there are mitigating circumstances, or denying responsibility for the alleged violations of University Of California Policies Applying to Campus Activities, Organizations, and Students.

D. 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.

For Graduates:

4. Hearing Procedures

- **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.

- **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.

- **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
academic misconduct.

E. Committee members will be given an opportunity to ask questions of the faculty member, the student, and witnesses.

F. Upon conclusion of this discussion, each party will be asked if there is any additional information needed or if any discrepancies or questions need to be presented or addressed.

G. All parties will be required to leave the room while the Committee deliberates. After its discussion, the Committee will decide if a preponderance of the evidence indicates that the student is responsible or not responsible for alleged violations of University of California Policies Applying to Campus Activities, Organizations, and Students by way of a simple majority vote.

H. If the student is found to be responsible for violations of Policies, 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 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

| 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 of the hearing panel, shall be made and retained in SCAIP or 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 F 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. |
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

V. APPEALS

Decisions of an instructor or Student Judicial Affairs 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.

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

The Academic Integrity Committees and the GAIC also function as the appellate bodies for decisions made at Review Stage 1. See Section E below for appeal procedures.

D. Review Stage 3: Annual Assessments of Cases and Appeals from Stage 2

Academic Integrity Executive Committee. For each hearing, the Vice Provost for Administrative Resolution or his designee shall select one Faculty member and one student from each Academic Integrity Committee to serve as the Campus Academic Integrity Executive Committee for undergraduates. A subcommittee of the Academic Senate Graduate Council will serve in this role for graduate students.

The Campus Academic Integrity Executive Committee also serves as the appellate body for primary decisions made at Review Stage 2 for undergraduate students. The Graduate Council serves as the appellate body for primary decisions made at Review Stage 2 for graduate students.
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

The Campus Academic Integrity Executive Committee additionally conducts annual assessments of SCAIP, GAIC, and Academic Integrity Committee actions for the purpose of providing oversight and ensuring that policies and procedures are appropriately and consistently applied.

E. Appeals
1. Channels for Appeals

For Undergraduate Students: Primary decisions of SCAIP may be appealed through the appropriate college/school Academic Integrity Committee. Appellate decisions by a college/school Academic Integrity Committee are final. Primary decisions of a college/school Academic Integrity Committee may be appealed to the Campus Academic Integrity Executive Committee. Appellate decisions by the Campus Academic Integrity Executive Committee are final.

For Graduate Students: Primary decisions of the Graduate Division 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.

2. 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

---

1 Primary in the policy refers to the initial review of cases and is sometimes qualified to reflect who is doing this first review (e.g. Primary SCAIP review or Primary AIC review).
2 Appellate refers to cases that were appealed and reflect the decision of the body reviewing and deciding on the appeal.
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

Either party may appeal a decision in writing to the appropriate Committee, through the University Administrator, within ten (10) business days after the written decision is made available. All 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, but interim action may be taken as determined by the Chair of the hearing. Grades or degrees may be withheld pending conclusion of the appeal.

When an appeal has been filed, the appropriate parties may be requested to respond in writing to the matters in question before a decision about the appeal is made. The Committee 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 adjudicator or adjudicating body, unless the appellate body determines that the original adjudicator or adjudicating body acted in an arbitrary, capricious, or unfair manner.

The Committee will make a decision based on the written submissions within fifteen (15) business days, or indicate in writing what further process is necessary for final resolution.

The Committee may approve, reject, or 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

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 10 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 will be withheld pending conclusion of the appeal.
- 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 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
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.

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 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.
- 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.

VI. MAINTENANCE OF RECORDS
Student Judicial Affairs shall serve as the central location where all written, tape recorded, 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 the Student Judicial Affairs for a period of at least five years from the date of

F. Maintenance of Records
Student Conduct and Academic Integrity Programs (for undergraduate students) and the Graduate Division (for graduate students) 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 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.

| 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 Vice Provost for Conflict Resolution. 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. |

**Justification:**

Proposed revisions to policy reflect recommendations by Academic Senate leadership to simplify and clarify the policy and proposal to 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.

Original policy 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.

**Presented for review to:**

Approved by the Executive Committee of CHASS: Date
Approved by the Executive Committee of CNAS: Date
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Approved by the Executive Committee of AGSM: Date
Approved by the Executive Committee of the GSOE: Date
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Approved by the Committee on Academic Freedom: Date
Approved by the Committee on Educational Policy: Date
The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording to be consistent with the code of the Academic Senate: 12/12/2011
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Proposed Changes to
Academic Integrity at the University of California, Riverside
(Approved by Educational Policy on 15 June 2005 after consultation with the Graduate Council)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>POLICY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Of California Policies Applying to Campus Activities, Organizations, and Students, section 100.00 Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline states that &quot;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...:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROCEDURES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Requirements and Expectations: Research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To foster intellectual honesty with regard to 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, and standards for merits and promotions which value quality over quantity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is the responsibility of each individual engaged in research at UCR to be informed of University policies relating to research and of...
### 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.

### II. 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.

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.

#### Allegations of Misconduct in Research

All allegations of research misconduct should be immediately reported to the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs. 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. Vice Chancellor for Research who serves as the UCR Research Integrity Officer.

The Vice Chancellor for Research or his/her designee will review the description of the academic misconduct and all documentation supporting the charge. He/she will determine 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.
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.

Requirements and Expectations: 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.

Courses

The table below shows the steps in the investigation and review process. The steps are the same for undergraduate students and graduate students, with the exception that different investigation bodies will participate in the Reviews.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible Body: Undergraduate Students</th>
<th>Responsible Body: Graduate Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiation of Cases</td>
<td>Faculty member</td>
<td>Faculty member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Stage 1</td>
<td>Review Stage 2</td>
<td>Review Stage 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student Conduct and Academic Integrity Programs [SCAIP]</strong></td>
<td><strong>Academic Integrity Committees of each college/school [AICs]</strong></td>
<td><strong>Annual assessments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs [Graduate Division]</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hearing panels constituted from the AICs</strong></td>
<td><strong>Graduate Academic Integrity Executive [GAIC]</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty member documents actions via Academic Misconduct Referral Form for Review Stage 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hearings for cases that are complex, egregious, and/or repeated cases of misconduct</strong></td>
<td><strong>Graduate Council</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty member documents actions via Academic Misconduct Referral Form for Review Stage 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Appeals of decisions made at Review Stage 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Annual assessments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty member documents actions via Academic Misconduct Referral Form for Review Stage 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hearings for cases that are complex, egregious, and/or repeated cases of misconduct</strong></td>
<td><strong>Annual assessments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty member documents actions via Academic Misconduct Referral Form for Review Stage 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Appeals of decisions made at Review Stage 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Annual assessments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty member documents actions via Academic Misconduct Referral Form for Review Stage 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hearings for cases that are complex, egregious, and/or repeated cases of misconduct</strong></td>
<td><strong>Annual assessments</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Faculty member documents actions via Academic Misconduct Referral Form for Review Stage 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Appeals of decisions made at Review Stage 1</strong></td>
<td><strong>Annual assessments</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If a faculty member, teaching assistant, or other instructional personnel suspects that an act of academic misconduct has occurred in a course, s/he 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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>of cases addressed at Review Stages 1 &amp; 2</th>
<th>Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appeals of primary decisions made at Review Stage 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 Vice Provost for Administrative Resolution. If the discovery is made by a 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.
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 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 students’ experience or knowledge of principles of academic integrity, the nature of the assignment, and the degree of intentionality and premeditation 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

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 is expected to assign a temporary grade placeholder of Grade Delay “GD” pending the outcome of
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 you have 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 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.

2. If the Faculty member makes a determination of misconduct based on facts that the accused student disputes:

The Faculty member will refer the case to SCAIP [or Graduate Division for graduate students] using the 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 (to include 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 administrative sanctions recommended by the Faculty member.

The Faculty member is encouraged to evaluate the disputed assignment or examination on its merits and to 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.

Comment [S1]: Baerenklau – The current SCAIP form does not allow the faculty member to recommend a sanction when the student disputes the facts. Suggest that the faculty member be allowed to recommend a sanction but determination of the sanction left to the administrative reviewer.
### 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".

### 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

Upon receipt of the Academic Misconduct Referral Form, SCAIP for Graduate...
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.

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 Division for graduate students] 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 SCAIP [or Graduate Division for graduate students] and will be sent to the student’s University e-mail address.

a. Initial [Administrative] Review process: The Initial [Administrative] Review, conducted by SCAIP [or Graduate Division for graduate students], 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 [or Graduate Division for graduate students] 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.
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.

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.

b. **Outcome of the Initial [Administrative] Review:** If SCAIP [or Graduate Division for graduate students] 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 SCAIP [or Graduate Division for graduate students] in writing to the student within 20 calendar days of the Initial 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 Review, he or she shall submit a final grade with to the Registrar that is consistent with the determination by SCAIP [or Graduate Division for graduate students] as to the question of misconduct.

3. **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 [or Graduate Division for graduate students] for a Stage 2 review by the Academic Integrity Committee in the relevant college/school or to the Graduate Academic Integrity Committee for a formal hearing.

4. **A student may not avoid the**
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, s/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.

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 with a grade of "W."

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 Colleges and for the Graduate Division/Professional Schools to:
- hear cases referred by Student Judicial Affairs 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 committee on Committees shall appoint 4 BCOE faculty, 4
AGSM faculty, 2 GSOE faculty, 6 CHASS faculty and 6 CNAS faculty to the panels to serve one year terms effective July 1-June 30. 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 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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Graduate Academic Integrity Committee for Cases Involving Graduate Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.

Faculty and student members should represent the disciplinary diversity within each college/school, whenever possible. Staff support to the committees will be provided by the office of the Vice Provost for Administrative Resolution, the office of the AVC/Dean of Students, and SCAIP.
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

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.

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.

3. Hearing Panels

For cases involving undergraduate students, SCAIP, will schedule a hearing panel of three to five members, from the relevant AIC for each case. For cases involving graduate students, the Associate Dean of the Graduate Division, in consultation with the chair of the GAIC, will schedule a hearing panel of three to five GAIC members. The Associate Dean or designee will serve as a non-voting administrative chair of the hearing panel. A quorum is required for a hearing to proceed and consists of three persons, including at least one faculty member and one student.

For undergraduates, the Vice Provost for Administrative Resolution or his/her designee will serve as a non-voting administrative chair of the hearing panel.
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 Chair to facilitate the hearing. The 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:

A. Committee members will receive and review a copy of the notification of charges and documentary evidence provided by the instructor, the University, and the student.

B. The Chair will ask all present at the hearing to introduce themselves for the record. The Chair will invite committee 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 as a result of prior involvement in the case or if the student believes for an appropriate reason that a committee member cannot render a just and fair decision.

C. The charges shall be read aloud and the student shall be asked to respond to the charges by accepting responsibility, accepting responsibility and noting that there are mitigating circumstances, or denying responsibility for the alleged violations of University Of California Policies Applying to Campus Activities, Organizations, and

to facilitate the hearing. For graduate students, the Associate Dean or designee will serve as a non-voting administrative chair 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.

For Graduates:

4. Hearing Procedures
- **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.

- **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**
Students.

D. 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.

E. Committee members will be given an opportunity to ask questions of the faculty member, the student, and witnesses.

F. Upon conclusion of this discussion, each party will be asked if there is any additional information needed or if any discrepancies or questions need to be presented or addressed.

G. All parties will be required to leave the room while the Committee deliberates. After its discussion, the Committee will decide if a preponderance of the evidence indicates that the student is responsible or not responsible for alleged violations of University of California Policies Applying to Campus Activities, Organizations, and Students by way of a simple majority vote.

H. If the student is found to be responsible for violations of Policies, 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

Discipline.

- 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.

- 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.

- 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, the committee will determine the 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.

- Notification of decision: Once the hearing panel has reached a decision, the parties will reassemble, and the
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 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

results of the deliberation will be presented. Within 20 calendar days, the Vice Provost for Administrative Resolution or designee for undergraduates, and Associate Dean of the Graduate Division for graduate students, 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 of the hearing panel, shall be made and retained in SCAIP or 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 F 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.
**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

### V. APPEALS

Decisions of an instructor or Student Judicial Affairs 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.

5. **Appeals of Decisions by Faculty Members and/or from Review Stage 1:**

The Academic Integrity Committees and the GAIC also function as the appellate bodies for decisions made at Review Stage 1. See Section E below for appeal procedures.

D. **Review Stage 3: Annual Assessments of Cases and Appeals from Stage 2**

Academic Integrity Executive Committee. For each hearing, the Vice Provost for Administrative Resolution or his designee shall select one Faculty member and one student from each Academic Integrity Committee to serve as the Campus Academic Integrity Executive Committee for undergraduates. A subcommittee of the Academic Senate Graduate Council will serve in this role for graduate students.

The Campus Academic Integrity Executive
Appeals must be based on one or more of the
Committee also serves as the appellate body for primary decisions made at Review Stage 2 for undergraduate students. The Graduate Council serves as the appellate body for primary decisions made at Review Stage 2 for graduate students.

The Campus Academic Integrity Executive Committee additionally conducts annual assessments of SCAIP, GAIC, and Academic Integrity Committee actions for the purpose of providing oversight and ensuring that policies and procedures are appropriately and consistently applied.

E. Appeals
1. Channels for Appeals

For Undergraduate Students: Primary decisions of SCAIP may be appealed through the appropriate college/school Academic Integrity Committee. Appellate decisions by a college/school Academic Integrity Committee are final. Primary decisions of a college/school Academic Integrity Committee may be appealed to the Campus Academic Integrity Executive Committee. Appellate decisions by the Campus Academic Integrity Executive Committee are final.

For Graduate Students: Primary decisions of the Graduate Division 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.

---

1 Primary in the policy refers to the initial review of cases and is sometimes qualified to reflect who is doing this first review (e.g. Primary SCAIP review or Primary AIC review).
2 Appellate refers to cases that were appealed and reflect the decision of the body reviewing and deciding on the appeal.
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

Either party may appeal a decision in writing to the appropriate Committee, through the University Administrator, within ten (10) business days after the written decision is made available. All 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, but interim action may be taken as determined by the Chair of the hearing. Grades or degrees may be withheld pending conclusion of the appeal.

When an appeal has been filed, the appropriate parties may be requested to respond in writing to the matters in question before a decision about the appeal is made. The Committee 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 adjudicator or adjudicating body, unless the appellate body determines that the original adjudicator or adjudicating body acted in an arbitrary, capricious, or unfair manner.

| of the Graduate Division will be the final arbiter. |

2. **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

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 10 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 will be withheld pending conclusion of the appeal.
- 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.
The Committee will make a decision based on the written submissions within fifteen (15) business days, or indicate in writing what further process is necessary for final resolution.

The Committee 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.

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, tape recorded, 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, and the Graduate Division (for graduate students) shall serve as the central location where all written, audio, and electronic records of incidents of academic misconduct are kept.

F. Maintenance of Records
Student Conduct and Academic Integrity Programs (for undergraduate students) and the Graduate Division (for graduate students) shall serve as the central location where all written, audio, and electronic records of incidents of academic misconduct are kept.

appeal is made. 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 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.
- 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.
| the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost | 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 the 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.

### Justification:

Proposed revisions to policy reflect recommendations by Academic Senate leadership to simplify and clarify the policy and proposal to 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.

Original policy 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.

**Presented for review to:**
Approved by the Executive Committee of CHASS: \[\text{Date}\]
# BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
## Proposed Changes to School of Medicine Bylaws

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Present</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ME1 Membership</strong></td>
<td><strong>ME1 Membership</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ME1.1</strong> The Faculty of the Division of Biomedical Sciences at the University of California, Riverside consists of (a) the President of the University; (b) the Chancellor; (c) the Executive Vice Chancellor; (d) the Dean of the Division of Biomedical Sciences; (e) all members of the Academic Senate who are members of the Division of Biomedical Sciences; (f) other Senate members as may be specified by the bylaws of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate.</td>
<td><strong>ME1.1</strong> The Faculty of the School of Medicine at the University of California, Riverside consists of (a) the President of the University; (b) the Chancellor; (c) the Executive Vice Chancellor; (d) the Dean of the School of Medicine; (e) all members of the Academic Senate who are members of the School of Medicine; (f) other Senate members as may be specified by the bylaws of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ME1.2</strong> Only voting members of the Academic Senate are eligible to vote in the Faculty of the Division of Biomedical Sciences. However, all persons with academic appointments in the Division of Biomedical Sciences with teaching responsibilities (e.g., the clinical faculty) may attend meetings of the Faculty and have the privilege of the floor. These clinical faculty members may vote on matters discussed in all faculty meetings, but their votes will be recorded as “advisory,” and kept separate from the votes recorded from Academic Senate members.</td>
<td><strong>ME1.2</strong> Only voting members of the Academic Senate are eligible to vote and to be counted toward a quorum in meetings of the Faculty of the School of Medicine. However, all persons with academic appointments in the School of Medicine with teaching responsibilities (e.g., faculty in the Clinical Professor series) may attend meetings of the Faculty and have the privilege of the floor. These clinical faculty members may vote on matters discussed in all faculty meetings, but their votes will be recorded as “advisory,” and kept separate from the votes recorded from Academic Senate members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ME2 Duties of Faculty</strong></td>
<td><strong>ME2.1</strong> The Faculty of the School of Medicine shall set policies for the admission of candidates for the degree of Doctor of Medicine and for completion of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME2 Officers</td>
<td>ME3 Officers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME2.1 The Officers of the Faculty consist of a Chair and a Vice Chair.</td>
<td>ME3.1 The Officers of the Faculty consist of a Chair and a Vice Chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME2.1.1 The Chair of the Faculty is elected for a three-year term and is not eligible to succeed himself/herself immediately. The election is conducted in accordance with the procedure prescribed in these bylaws. If the Chair is unable to complete the term of office, the Secretary-Parliamentarian of the Division of the Academic Senate shall within two months conduct an election in accordance with the procedure prescribed in these bylaws for the unexpired term provided that the unexpired term is longer than six months. In the interim or in the event the vacated term is less than six months, the Vice Chair will serve as Chair.</td>
<td>ME3.1.1 The Chair of the Faculty is elected for a three-year term and is not eligible to succeed himself/herself immediately. The election is conducted in accordance with the procedure prescribed in these bylaws. If the Chair is unable to complete the term of office, the Secretary-Parliamentarian of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate shall within two months conduct an election in accordance with the procedure prescribed in these bylaws for the unexpired term provided that the unexpired term is longer than six months. In the interim or in the event the vacated term is less than six months, the Vice Chair will serve as Chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME2.1.2 The Vice Chair is chosen by the Executive Committee from among its membership. The term of office is two years.</td>
<td>ME3.1.2 The Vice Chair is chosen by the Faculty Executive Committee from among its membership. The term of office is two years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME2.1.3 The Chair assumes office on the first day of September following his/her election at a regular election or immediately upon completion of the ballot count at a special election. The Vice Chair takes office immediately upon appointment.</td>
<td>ME3.1.3 The Chair assumes office on the first day of September following his/her election at a regular election or immediately upon completion of the ballot count at a special election. The Vice Chair takes office immediately upon appointment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME3 Meetings</td>
<td>ME4 Meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME3.1 Meetings are called by the Chair of the Faculty or by the Executive Committee. At the written request of twenty-five percent of the voting members of the faculty, the Chair must call a meeting. He/she must call at least one meeting each academic quarter in each year. The faculty meeting may be chaired by the Chair of the Faculty or by the Vice Chair.</td>
<td>ME4.1 Meetings are called by the Chair of the Faculty or by the Faculty Executive Committee. At the written request of fifteen percent of the voting members of the faculty, the Chair must call a meeting. He/she must call at least one meeting each year. The faculty meeting may be chaired by the Chair of the Faculty or by the Vice Chair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME3.1.1 A quorum consists of fifty-percent of the members of the Faculty.</td>
<td>ME4.1.1 A quorum consists of thirty percent of the members of the Faculty, or ten Faculty members, whichever number is</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A motion to submit a measure to mail or secret ballot has precedence over a motion for an open vote in a meeting.

The Chair of the Faculty will send, prior to the faculty meeting, copies of the call for the meeting and will make all pertinent documents available to each member of the Faculty. The Faculty shall not change curricular requirements of the Division or change these bylaws at the meetings at which such proposals for change are first made unless notice is previously given to all members of the Faculty in a call to the meeting.

These bylaws constitute primary rules of order for meetings of the Faculty and of the committees of the Faculty. The order of business is that prescribed in Chapter 4 of the Bylaws of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate.

The minutes of every meeting of the Faculty (with the exception of those concerned with personnel matters) shall be sent before the next faculty meeting to every member of the Faculty. For personnel matters, faculty may consider the departmental letter in lieu of minutes for these meetings. Opportunities for review and/or comment of the departmental letter are as prescribed in the APM.

ME4 Committees

Standing Committees: There shall be six standing committees of the School of Medicine: The Faculty Executive Committee, the Medical Education Committee, the Medical School Admissions Committee, the Medical School Progress and Promotions Committee, the Graduate Advisory Committee, and the Volunteer Clinical Appointments Committee. Each Standing Committee may appoint such subcommittees as it deems necessary to conduct its business.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ME4.1</th>
<th>There shall be an Executive Committee consisting of at least four (4) Faculty members and the Chair of the Faculty. The Dean and the Associate Dean of the Division of Biomedical Sciences will serve as ex officio members of this committee.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ME5.2</td>
<td>There shall be a Faculty Executive Committee consisting of at least eight (8) Faculty members and the Chair of the Faculty, who serves as Committee Chair. The Dean and the Senior Executive Dean of the School of Medicine will serve as non-voting ex officio members of this committee. In addition, two representatives shall be elected by the faculty in the clinical series (who are not members of the Academic Senate), and these representatives shall be entitled to participate in the deliberations of the Committee, but without the right to vote (as in Bylaw 1.2). These elected representatives must hold at least half-time appointments in the Clinical Professor series of the School of Medicine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME4.1.1</td>
<td>The faculty of the Division of Biomedical Sciences will elect the four (4) representatives to the Executive Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME5.2.1</td>
<td>The faculty of the School of Medicine will elect the eight (8) representatives, four from the Division of Biomedical Sciences and four from the Division of Clinical Sciences, to the Faculty Executive Committee. If there are not enough faculty members available from either Division, unfilled positions will be filled by members of the other Division.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME4.1.2</td>
<td>The term of office of members of the Executive Committee is two years, and these members are eligible for reappointment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME5.2.2</td>
<td>The term of office of members of the Faculty Executive Committee is two years, and these members are eligible for reappointment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME4.1.3</td>
<td>The election of Faculty members is as provided in chapter 7 of the Bylaws of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate. For purposes of these elections, members of the Executive Committee are considered officers of the Faculty of the Division. Members of the Executive Committee take office on September first of the academic year following their election at a regular election or immediately upon completion of the ballot count at a special election.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME5.2.3</td>
<td>The election of Faculty members is as provided in chapter 7 of the Bylaws of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate. For purposes of these elections, members of the Faculty Executive Committee are considered officers of the Faculty of the School. Members of the Faculty Executive Committee take office on September first of the academic year following their election at a regular election or immediately upon completion of the ballot count at a special election.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME4.1.4</td>
<td>Whenever the Executive Committee determines that a vacancy exists in its membership, the Secretary-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME5.2.4</td>
<td>Whenever the Faculty Executive Committee determines that a vacancy exists in its membership, the Secretary-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parliamentarian of the Division of the Academic Senate conducts an election in accordance with the prescribed procedure provided the vacancy is to last more than six months. A vacancy shall be declared to exist and the committee member considered to have resigned if she/he anticipates an absence from the committee of more than six months. Vacancies of six months or less are filled temporarily by appointment by the Chair of the Faculty with the advice and consent of the Executive Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ME4.1.5</th>
<th>The Executive Committee has the following functions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ME4.1.5.1</td>
<td>The Executive Committee has the general oversight of the academic welfare and discipline of students in the Division and has the power to bring before the Faculty any matters that the Committee deems advisable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME4.1.5.2</td>
<td>The Executive Committee appoints and designates the Chairs of all other standing committees and all special committees of the Faculty unless otherwise directed at a meeting of the Faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME4.1.5.3</td>
<td>The Executive Committee acts finally for the Faculty (a) in the awarding of all degrees to students of the Division in all cases which do not involve the suspension of regulations or that involve only minor adjustments in the curricula and (b) in the awarding of honors at graduation. The Committee is likewise empowered to act on petitions of students for graduation under suspension of the regulations. The Committee will report all degrees approved to the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME4.1.5.4</td>
<td>The Executive Committee makes recommendations to the Faculty in the establishment, modification, and discontinuation of all divisional instructional programs and curricula.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME4.1.5.5</td>
<td>The Executive Committee acts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parliamentarian of the Division of the Academic Senate conducts an election in accordance with the prescribed procedure provided the vacancy is to last more than six months. A vacancy shall be declared to exist and the committee member considered to have resigned if she/he anticipates an absence from the committee of more than six months. Vacancies of six months or less are filled temporarily by appointment by the Chair of the Faculty with the advice and consent of the Faculty Executive Committee.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ME5.2.5</th>
<th>The Faculty Executive Committee has the following functions:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ME5.2.5.1</td>
<td>The Faculty Executive Committee has the general oversight of the academic welfare and discipline of students in the School and has the power to bring before the Faculty any matters that the Committee deems advisable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME5.2.5.2</td>
<td>The Faculty Executive Committee appoints and designates the Chairs of all other standing committees, and all special committees of the Faculty unless otherwise directed at a meeting of the Faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME5.2.5.3</td>
<td>The Faculty Executive Committee acts finally for the Faculty (a) in the awarding of all degrees to students of the School in all cases which do not involve the suspension of regulations or that involve only minor adjustments in the curricula and (b) in the awarding of honors at graduation. The Committee is likewise empowered to act on petitions of students for graduation under suspension of the regulations. The Committee will report all degrees approved to the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME5.2.5.4</td>
<td>The Faculty Executive Committee makes recommendations to the Faculty in the establishment, modification, and discontinuation of all School instructional programs and curricula.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME5.2.5.5</td>
<td>The Faculty Executive Committee acts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
for the Faculty in making recommendations to the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate regarding courses.

| ME4.2 | The duty of this Committee is to advise on matters pertaining to the educational policy and curriculum of the UCR medical school program. |
| ME4.2.1 | This Committee is also subject to the Bylaws of the UCLA School of Medicine. |
| ME4.2.2 | This Committee is also subject to the Bylaws of the UCLA School of Medicine. |
| ME4.3 | The duty of this Committee is to recommend to the Faculty Executive Committee of the UCLA School of Medicine the admission of students into the medical school portion of the UCR/UCLA Thomas Haider Program in Biomedical Sciences. |
| ME4.3.1 | This Committee will have at least three (3) subcommittees: Subcommittee A (The Haider Program in Biomedical Sciences Subcommittee), and |

Committee acts for the Faculty in making recommendations to the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate regarding course and program changes.

| ME5.3 | The duty of this Committee is to advise on matters pertaining to the educational policy and curriculum of the UCR School of Medicine. |
| ME5.3.1 | This Committee will have two (2) subcommittees: the Pre-Clerkship Subcommittee and the Clerkship Subcommittee, responsible for matters pertaining to the curriculum. |
| ME5.3.2 | This Committee will have at least three (3) subcommittees: Subcommittee A (The Haider Program in Biomedical Sciences Subcommittee), and |

<p>| ME5.3.1 | The duty of this Committee is to advise on matters pertaining to the educational policy and curriculum of the UCR School of Medicine. |
| ME5.4 | The duty of this Committee is to recommend to the Faculty Executive Committee the admission of students into the UCR School of Medicine. |
| ME5.4.1 | The duty of this Committee is to recommend to the Faculty Executive Committee the admission of students into the UCR School of Medicine. |
| ME5.4.2 | The duty of this Committee is to recommend to the Faculty Executive Committee the admission of students into the UCR School of Medicine. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ME4.3.2</td>
<td>This Committee is also subject to the Bylaws of the UCLA School of Medicine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME4.4</td>
<td>There shall be a Medical School Promotions Committee composed of at least 6 (6) faculty members plus the Chair, typically chosen from those who serve as course coordinators with representatives of both clinical and ladder-rank faculty. The Dean of the Division serves as an ex officio and non-voting member of this committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME4.4.1</td>
<td>The duty of this Committee is to recommend to the Faculty Executive Committee of the UCLA School of Medicine the promotion of medical students from the first year to the second year, and from the second year to the third year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME4.4.2</td>
<td>This Committee is also subject to the Bylaws of the UCLA School of Medicine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME4.5</td>
<td>There shall be a Graduate Advisory Committee consisting of three faculty members and two Graduate Advisor(s). One Graduate Advisor will be responsible for recruitment and admission of graduate students and the other Graduate Advisor will be responsible for enrolled student affairs. All Biomedical Sciences Graduate Program faculty members in good standing are eligible for election to this Graduate Advisory Committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME4.5.1</td>
<td>The duty of this Committee is to advise the Biomedical Sciences Graduate Program faculty on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME5.5</td>
<td>There shall be a Medical School Progress and Promotions Committee appointed by the Faculty Executive Committee composed of at least six (6) members plus a Chair, typically chosen from those who serve as pre-clerkship course coordinators or clerkship directors, with representatives of both Biomedical Sciences and Clinical Sciences faculty. The Senior Associate Dean for Education serves as an ex officio member of this committee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME5.5.1</td>
<td>The duty of this Committee is to recommend to the Faculty Executive Committee the promotion of medical students from the first year to the second year, from the second year to the third year, and from the third to the fourth year, as well as recommend students for graduation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME5.6</td>
<td>There shall be a Graduate Advisory Committee consisting of three faculty members and two Graduate Advisor(s). One Graduate Advisor will be responsible for recruitment and admission of graduate students and the other Graduate Advisor will be responsible for enrolled student affairs. All Biomedical Sciences Graduate Program faculty members in good standing are eligible for service on the Graduate Advisory Committee. Members of the committee are appointed by the Senior Associate Dean for Academic Affairs and Research, upon recommendation of the Graduate Advisors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME5.6.1</td>
<td>The duty of this Committee is to advise the School of Medicine faculty on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program faculty on matters pertaining to graduate degree programs.</td>
<td>matters pertaining to Ph.D., M.D.-Ph.D. and M.S. degree programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ME4.6</strong> There shall be a Volunteer Clinical Appointments and Advancements Committee. The Committee shall consist of three (3) faculty members, the Director of Clinical Instruction and up to three (3) volunteer clinical faculties.</td>
<td><strong>ME5.7</strong> There shall be a Volunteer Clinical Appointments and Advancements Committee. The Committee shall consist of three (3) faculty members, the Chair of the Division of Clinical Sciences and up to three (3) faculty members in the Volunteer Clinical Professor series.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ME4.6.1</strong> The duty of this Committee is to advise the Chair and faculty members of the Division of Biomedical Sciences, the Dean of the Division, and the Executive Vice Chancellor on appointments and advances of clinical faculty to Assistant Clinical Professor, Associate Clinical Professor, and Full Clinical Professor levels.</td>
<td><strong>ME5.7.1</strong> The duty of this Committee is to advise the Chair and faculty members of the School of Medicine, the Dean, and the Executive Vice Chancellor on appointments and advances of clinical faculty to Volunteer Assistant, Volunteer Associate, and Volunteer Full Clinical Professor levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ME4.6.2</strong> This Committee is subject to the procedures of Volunteer Clinical Appointments as outlined in the Memorandum of Understanding of 9/2003 and subsequent changes approved by the Faculty of the Division of Biomedical Sciences, the Dean of the Division, and the Executive Vice Chancellor.</td>
<td><strong>ME5.7.2</strong> This Committee is subject to the procedures of Volunteer Clinical Appointments as outlined in the Memorandum of Understanding of 9/2003 and subsequent changes that are approved by the Faculty of the School of Medicine, the Dean, and the Executive Vice Chancellor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ME4.6.3</strong> Members of this Committee will be appointed annually by the Executive Committee of the Division of Biomedical Sciences with no limit on the period of service.</td>
<td><strong>ME5.7.3</strong> Members of this Committee will be appointed by the Faculty Executive Committee of the School of Medicine, with renewable two year terms of service.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ME5</strong> Election and Balloting</td>
<td><strong>ME6</strong> Election and Balloting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ME5.1</strong> Elections are conducted as specified in ME2.1.1, ME2.1.2, and ME4.1.3.</td>
<td><strong>ME6.1</strong> Elections are conducted as specified in ME3.1.1, ME3.1.2, and ME5.2.3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ME5.1.1</strong> Balloting on measures referred to the whole Faculty of the Division by action of a meeting of the Faculty are conducted by the Secretary-Parliamentarian of the Division of the Academic Senate following the provisions of chapter 7 of the bylaws of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate.</td>
<td><strong>ME6.1.1</strong> Balloting on measures referred to the whole Faculty of the School by action of a meeting of the Faculty are conducted by the Secretary-Parliamentarian of the Division of the Academic Senate following the provisions of chapter 7 of the bylaws of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ME6</strong> Amendments and Suspensions of Bylaws and Regulations</td>
<td><strong>ME7</strong> Amendments and Suspensions of Bylaws and Regulations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
These bylaws can be amended or suspended only as provided in chapter 6 of the bylaws of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate and in ME3.1.3.

Approved by the Biomedical Sciences Executive Committee: 01/10/2012

Approved by the Faculty of the School of Medicine: 01/10/2012

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording consistent with the code of the Academic Senate: 1/16/2012

Received by the Executive Council __________________
Defining Academic Freedom
December 21, 2010 - 3:00am
Cary Nelson

Over the course of decades, a great many books, essays, and policies have been written and published about academic freedom. We have learned how to apply it to pedagogical, technological, cultural, and political realities that did not exist when the concept was first defined. Not only faculty members, administrators, trustees, and students, but also parents, politicians, and other members of the public, would now benefit from a concise summary of its major features. Sometimes academic freedom is invoked in situations where it doesn't actually apply. But many within and without higher education are not well-versed in all the protections it does provide. This statement is designed to help clarify both what academic freedom does and doesn't do.

PART 1: What it does do

1. Academic freedom means that both faculty members and students can engage in intellectual debate without fear of censorship or retaliation.

2. Academic freedom establishes a faculty member’s right to remain true to his or her pedagogical philosophy and intellectual commitments. It preserves the intellectual integrity of our educational system and thus serves the public good.

3. Academic freedom in teaching means that both faculty members and students can make comparisons and contrasts between subjects taught in a course and any field of human knowledge or period of history.

4. Academic freedom gives both students and faculty the right to express their views — in speech, writing, and through electronic communication, both on and off campus — without fear of sanction, unless the manner of expression substantially impairs the rights of others or, in the case of faculty members, those views demonstrate that they are professionally ignorant, incompetent, or dishonest with regard to their discipline or fields of expertise.

5. Academic freedom gives both students and faculty the right to study and do research on the topics they choose and to draw what conclusions they find consistent with their research, though it does not prevent others from judging whether their work is valuable and their conclusions sound. To protect academic freedom, universities should oppose efforts by corporate or government sponsors to block dissemination of any research findings.

6. Academic freedom means that the political, religious, or philosophical beliefs of politicians, administrators, and members of the public cannot be imposed on students or faculty.

7. Academic freedom gives faculty members and students the right to seek redress or request a hearing if they believe their rights have been violated.
8. Academic freedom protects faculty members and students from reprisals for disagreeing with administrative policies or proposals.

9. Academic freedom gives faculty members and students the right to challenge one another’s views, but not to penalize them for holding them.

10. Academic freedom protects a faculty member’s authority to assign grades to students, so long as the grades are not capricious or unjustly punitive. More broadly, academic freedom encompasses both the individual and institutional right to maintain academic standards.

11. Academic freedom gives faculty members substantial latitude in deciding how to teach the courses for which they are responsible.

12. Academic freedom guarantees that serious charges against a faculty member will be heard before a committee of his or her peers. It provides faculty members the right to due process, including the assumption that the burden of proof lies with those who brought the charges, that faculty have the right to present counter-evidence and confront their accusers, and be assisted by an attorney in serious cases if they choose.

PART 2: What It Doesn’t Do

1. Academic freedom does not mean a faculty member can harass, threaten, intimidate, ridicule, or impose his or her views on students.

2. Student academic freedom does not deny faculty members the right to require students to master course material and the fundamentals of the disciplines that faculty teach.

3. Neither academic freedom nor tenure protects an incompetent teacher from losing his or her job. Academic freedom thus does not grant an unqualified guarantee of lifetime employment.

4. Academic freedom does not protect faculty members from colleague or student challenges to or disagreement with their educational philosophy and practices.

5. Academic freedom does not protect faculty members from non-university penalties if they break the law.

6. Academic freedom does not give students or faculty the right to ignore college or university regulations, though it does give faculty and students the right to criticize regulations they believe are unfair.

7. Academic freedom does not protect students or faculty from disciplinary action, but it does require that they receive fair treatment and due process.
8. Academic freedom does not protect faculty members from sanctions for professional misconduct, though sanctions require clear proof established through due process.

9. Neither academic freedom nor tenure protects a faculty member from various sanctions — from denial of merit raises, to denial of sabbatical requests, to the loss of desirable teaching and committee assignments — for poor performance, though such sanctions are regulated by local agreements and by faculty handbooks. If minor, sanctions should be grievable; if major, they must be preceded by an appropriate hearing.

10. Neither academic freedom nor tenure protects a faculty member who repeatedly skips class or refuses to teach the classes or subject matter assigned.

11. Though briefly interrupting an invited speaker may be compatible with academic freedom, actually preventing a talk or a performance from continuing is not.

12. Academic freedom does not protect a faculty member from investigations into allegations of scientific misconduct or violations of sound university policies, nor from appropriate penalties should such charges be sustained in a hearing of record before an elected faculty body.

These points are mostly adapted from nearly 100 years of American Association of University Professors policy documents and reports. Since its 1915 founding, the AAUP has been the primary source of the documents outlining the basic principles of faculty rights and responsibilities. It is also the source of perhaps the single best statement of student rights. Putting the principles above into practice, of course, requires a goodly amount of additional detail, information the AAUP continues to provide and update.

Author's Bio

Cary Nelson is president of the American Association of University Professors and professor of English at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign. He is the author, most recently, of No University Is an Island: Saving Academic Freedom (NYU, 2010).

Read more:
http://www.insidehighered.com/views/2010/12/21/nelson_on_academic_freedom#ixzz2eFjH1bFf
Inside Higher Ed