May 6, 2010

TO:  Kathleen Montgomery, Vice Chair, AGSM
     Dan Ozer, Secretary Parliamentarian, Psychology
     Richard Arnott, Economics
     Steve Axelrod, English
     Jay Farrell, Electrical Engineering
     Christine Gailey, Women’s studies
     John Ganim, English
     George Haggerty, English
     Dan Hare, Entomology
     David Herzberger, Hispanic Studies
     Carol Lovatt, Botany and Plant Sciences
     Manuela Martins-Green, Cell Biology and Neuroscience
     Doug Mitchell, GSOE
     Len Mueller, Chemistry
     Vivian-Lee Nyitray, Religious studies
     Erik Rolland, AGSM
     John Trumble, Entomology
     Ameae Walker, Biomedical Sciences
     Albert Wang, Electrical Engineering
     Alan Williams, Earth Sciences
     Jose Wudka, Physics
     Marylynn Yates, Environmental Sciences

FR:  Tony Norman, Chair
     Riverside Division

RE:  Executive Council Agenda, May 10, 2010

This is to confirm the meeting of the Executive Council on Monday, May 10, 2010 at 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. in Room 145 UOB 1st floor University Office Building.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Enclosures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.</td>
<td>Approval of the May 10, 2010 Agenda and April 26, 2010 Meeting Notes.</td>
<td>1 (pp. 1-6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.</td>
<td>VICE CHANCELLOR PETER HAYASHIDA:</td>
<td>2 (pp. 7 - 19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.</td>
<td>PROFESSOR OF THE GRADUATE DIVISION: Proposal was approved by CEP, GC, CAP and FW. Requires endorsement from EC and then will go to Division for adoption</td>
<td>3 (pp. 20 - 21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV.</td>
<td>PROPOSED CHANGES TO REGULATION 6 – CAMPUS GRADUATION REQUIREMENT: At present the university does not have a policy that allows for deferral or withholding of degree. Students who are involved in serious violations of university policy in their final quarter of enrollment, academic or social, typically face no disciplinary consequences for their misconduct as they are able to complete their degree and leave the University before the disciplinary issue can be resolved.</td>
<td>4 (pp. 22 - 54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V.</td>
<td>ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY: Proposal has been reviewed by the committees and now requires endorsement from EC. Issue to consider is whether a separate standing committee of the senate is required to deal with Graduate integrity issues – see page 18 and if so, how should it function?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>ANY OTHER BUSINESS:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EXECUTIVE COUNCIL MEETING
MINUTES
APRIL 26, 2010

PRESENT:
Anthony Norman, Chair
Kathleen Montgomery, AGSM, Vice Chair
Dan Ozer, Psychology, Secretary Parliamentarian
Richard Arnott, Economics, Research
Jay Farrell, Electrical Engineering, BSOE Executive Committee
Dan Hare, Entomology, Faculty Welfare
David Herzberger, Hispanic Studies, CHASS Executive Committee
Manuela Martins-Green, Cell Biology and Neuroscience, Sr. Rep to the Assembly
Doug Mitchell, GSOE Executive Committee
Erik Rolland, AGSM Executive Committee
John Trumble, Entomology, CAP
Ameae Walker, Biomedical Sciences Executive Committee
Jose Wudka, Physics, Educational Policy
Marylynn Yates, Environmental Sciences, CNAS Executive Committee

ABSENT:
Steven Axelrod, English, Preparatory Education
Christine Gailey, Women’s studies, Committees
John Ganim, English, Physical Resource Planning
Carol Lovatt, Botany and Plant Sciences, Planning and Budget
Len Mueller, Chemistry, Academic Computing
Vivian-Lee Nyitray, Religious studies, Undergraduate Admissions
Albert Wang, Electrical Engineering, Junior Rep to the Assembly
Alan Williams, Earth Sciences, Graduate Council

GUESTS:
Barry Arnold – for COC
Morris Maduro – for Graduate Council
EVC and Provost Dallas Rabenstein
VPUE David Fairris

CONSENT CALENDAR:
The agenda and the minutes were approved as written.

EVC and Provost Dallas Rabenstein:
EVCP Dallas Rabenstein indicated that he was going to talk about the Strategic Plan process, English 1C and Summer School.
Strategic Plan:

EVCP Dallas Rabenstein distributed a schematic (pyramid) handout of the Strategic Plan. This summarized what he believes be the ‘form’ of the final UCR Strategic Planning report. The top of the pyramid is the Chancellor’s public strategic planning document, and hopefully will not exceed 40 pages. The foundation of the pyramid is the eight Strategic Plan subcommittee reports.

The Chancellor’s overall Strategic Plan will be written for a multiple audience including the Board of Regents. In 40 pages, it is not possible to address and plan everything that UCR wants to do – and thus, there will be a number of cross-culture working papers, some of them on topics such as the working paper on Transparency, working paper on Research and the Research Office, and a working paper on the Implementation of the plan. He indicated that these additional documents will be important as we move forward, but it is not the kind of information you want to include in a report to be read by the Board of Regents. There will be in toto about 8 or 9 working papers. In 2011, the Implementation of the plan will begin. The committee charged with implementation will have all the information of the total pyramid to work with.

EVCP Dallas Rabenstein thanked the EC for the 11 reports that were received from the Senate. They also received feedback from the faculty, and from the community. He stated that there are many different views on what should be contained in the Strategic Plan and that they are rewriting the draft.

He cautioned that it is impossible to please everyone and he realizes that some will wonder whether the writing team read the feedback that was provided to them. The writing team is revising Draft #1. In the revised document, the major overarching principle is Excellence. EVCP Rabenstein hopes to get Draft #2 out by Friday May 7. Draft 2 will be released with all of the Working Papers to enable people to see the complete plan. The implementation of the plan will not be too prescriptive.

EVCP Rabenstein also mentioned that the Academic Excellence on-line survey results are available, and Steve Brint will be making a presentation of the survey in Hub 302. He encouraged the EC members to attend if they could. There were about 300 responses – and one issue that kept coming up was that the faculty want excellence.

English 1C:

As an update, EVCP Rabenstein indicated that English 1C is offered through the Writing Program which is administered by the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education Prof. Dave Fairris. English 3, 4 and 5 are required of students who have not tested into English 1A. English 1A, 1B and 1C are required courses. EVCP Rabenstein indicated that UCR is going through a transition period in which Writing Across the Curriculum courses are being developed as an alternative to English 1C. They are more discipline specific and the first courses offered were in Religious Studies. The idea has been adopted by some colleges and schools. So far CNAS is the only College that has not signed on. This is a transition year. It will be a while before this is all settled. He further mentioned that planning for English 1C is problematic. This year, there were enough sections to meet the needs of all juniors and seniors. Next year, all juniors and seniors will be offered English 1C so they can
satisfy the requirements that way, and the expectation is that there will be more Writing Across the Curriculum offerings. There will probably be a need to offer more 1C sections next year to accommodate more students. Unfortunately this is a budget issue. Running the Writing Program requires the equivalent of 55 faculty lines and this year they had to supplement this with 50% additional FTEs- which came to an equivalent of 80 FTEs or \( \sim 800,000 \). These are FTEs that are currently not available to offer to departments. Expanding on why the Writing Program costs so much, EVCP Rabenstein indicated that the Writing Program is taught by lecturers. The lecturers are unionized and each section has 23-24 students and they cannot make them larger. In his opinion, there needs to be a more efficient way of teaching English 1C.

EVCP Rabenstein also indicated that he would like to discuss how English composition is offered at the other UC campuses and handed out a document that summarized the offerings by campus. He pointed out that UCR has the strictest requirement; every other campus has a more flexible requirement. On other campuses, Writing is taught in a variety of different ways and he urged the EC to look and consider this issue seriously. He indicated that if the Senate reached a decision that English 1C is an absolute requirement, then they will fund. He also indicated that this past fall, students who were in English 5 were put into English 1A and the results were encouraging. VP Fairris is going to encourage the Committee on Preparatory Education to give him approval to move the best students from English 4 into English 1A to see how far they can go.

The EC members pointed out that students who come to UCR usually have lower SAT scores and as such cannot be compared to students from other campuses. Marylynn Yates, Chair of CNAS Executive Committee indicated this was one reason why the CNAS Executive Committee did not approve the Writing Across the Curriculum proposal. They thought that English composition needs to be taught by people who are trained to teach English composition and not by TAs.

One EC member indicated that it would be beneficial to find out if English 1C actually benefits students.

**Summer Sessions:**
As an introduction, EVCP Rabenstein indicated that summer sessions is part of our regular academic quarter. The State provides funding for the 1185 matriculated students – 1/3 of the funding is taken off the top for financial aid. Summer Session is intended to operate as a regular instructional quarter with state funding. In the past, we have never reached the targeted number of 1185. However, this year, 7 days after enrollment was opened on Wednesday April 7th, it appeared that we were going to be over-enrolled. This is why Mr. Leonard Taylor, the Director of Summer Sessions sent out an email to all faculty and staff indicating that enrollment to summer sessions had been stopped. If we go over the number allowed, UCR gets their fees but no state funding is available to cover those students that are overenrolled. EVCP Rabenstein could not pinpoint a specific reason why so many students signed up early for summer sessions. Because our UCR Bridge program students had not had the opportunity to enroll, the decision was made to close enrollment. Enrollment was reopened and things are back to normal.
Prior to summer sessions becoming a regular quarter, it was run by Summer Sessions through the Extension and departments paid the faculty for teaching them. Now Summer Sessions are run out of the Vice Provost for Undergraduate Education office. So now that it is part of our regular academic year, the plan is that faculty still get extra compensation for teaching and from the faculty’s point of view, nothing has changed. VPUE Fairris added that this year, we will be overenrolled by 150 students.

A Revised Registration Fee Policy:
The EC members discussed the revised fee policy which was to be proposed to the Regents. Chair Norman asked for feedback from the EC that he could take back to Council. The following points were raised:

- International Student Program – what does that mean – it is too vague
- Why is there no separation between the undergraduate and graduate fees? The funds are oriented more towards the needs of undergraduate students and not graduate students.
- The idea that the Regents will annually review the registration fee policy was disconcerting and it gave the impression that it would go up every year.

Any Other Business:
Chair Norman reported the following:

1. Election of the Vice Chair of the Assembly for 2010-2011 which took place at the last Assembly meeting held via teleconference on Wednesday April 21, 2010. Professor Robert Anderson was elected and will serve as the Vice Chair of the Senate for 2010-2011 and as Chair in 2011-2012.
2. UCR will be hosting an African American Black Student Conference on Friday and Saturday April 30, 2010
3. The Senate Exit Survey is ready for circulation and will be posted on the Senate webpage. It will be password protected.
4. The Chili cook-off is scheduled for May 7, 2010 at 5:00PM in the botanic gardens.
5. Chair Norman gave an update of the EH&S department.

On another issue, Chair Norman sought the advice of the EC members with regard to using passwords on the senate webpage. It has become apparent that having the two ways of signing on to the senate’s secure webpage confuses some faculty members, and as such, Chair Norman was proposed that the Senate has only way to sign on and that is by using the assigned UCR NET ID. The EC members voted unanimously to support the idea.

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 PM.

Respectfully submitted,
Sellyna Ehlers
Executive Director
Academic Senate
March 23, 2010

TO: DAN HARE, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE

JOHN TRUMBLE, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

ALAN WILLIAMS, CHAIR
GRADUATE COUNCIL

JOSE WUDKA, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

FM: ANTHONY W. NORMAN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

RE: PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH THE UCR PROGRAM FOR PROFESSOR OF THE GRADUATE DIVISION (PGD)

Attached for your review is the proposal to establish the UCR Program for Professor of the Graduate Division (PGD). The Professor of the Graduate Division (PGD) is a program that would be available to UCR retiring/retired faculty who are fully engaged in research and/or other departmental and campus activities and who wish to continue to contribute to UC and UCR with distinction after their retirement from official active faculty status.

The proposal is modeled on a similar program at UC Berkeley, which has been in place since 1991. (Appendix A contains a description of their program and endorsement from two recently retired UCB faculty.)

Please review and return your comments to me by MONDAY, APRIL 19, 2010
PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH THE UCR PROGRAM FOR PROFESSOR OF THE GRADUATE DIVISION (PGD)

Background
The Professor of the Graduate Division (PGD) is a program that would be available to UCR retiring/retired faculty who are fully engaged in research and/or other departmental and campus activities and who wish to continue to contribute to UC and UCR with distinction after their retirement from official active faculty status.

The proposal is modeled on a similar program at UC Berkeley, which has been in place since 1991. (Appendix A contains a description of their program and endorsement from two recently retired UCB faculty.)

An exploratory poll of 60 recently retired UCR faculty from BCOE, CNAS, and CHASS (conducted by Tony Norman in December 2009) received favorable feedback: of 20 respondents, 17 expressed strong interest in the PGD opportunity. Preliminary discussions with the Chancellor, the Deans, and the Graduate Dean also resulted in strongly favorable feedback.

OUTLINE OF THE PROPOSAL

Purpose
To retain and encourage active participation of retiring faculty who are fully engaged in research and/or other departmental and campus activities and who wish to continue to contribute to UCR with distinction.

Privileges
The PGD program would carry benefits both to the individuals and to the campus, including:

1. PGD faculty would be identified (in the campus catalog and elsewhere) by the title “Professor of the Graduate Division” rather than “Professor Emeritus/a.”

2. PGD faculty would have the authority to seek outside grants and serve as PI, similar to that of active faculty.
3. PGD faculty could serve as dissertation supervisors and on graduate exam committees; PGD faculty could teach and engage in administrative service. (Note that arrangements for teaching under the UC retirement recall program would be negotiated separately from the PGD program; not all retired faculty on recall would hold the title of PGD, and not all holding the title of PGD would be involved in the retirement recall program.)

4. PGD faculty would have the departmental voting privileges of Emeriti/ae as established under Senate bylaw 55.

5. The title of PGD carries no remuneration.

**Eligibility and Appointment Procedure**

1. To be eligible, retiring/retired faculty should have undergone a merit review during the last 3 years. (Exceptions to this could be considered for faculty applicants who have been retired longer than 4 years.)

2. The initial appointment would be for three years, with the possibility of annual renewal thereafter, based on the review procedures outlined below.

3. The applicant should submit the following materials for review:
   a. A self-statement describing the perceived benefits to the candidate and contributions to the campus that will result from having a PGD appointment
   b. An updated UC Bio-bibliography
   c. A summary of scholarly activity during the past three years (publications, grant activity, presentations and invited talks, graduate student and/or postdoctoral training)

4. Departmental review and letter
   a. The review shall contain a vote of departmental faculty on the proposed appointment
   b. Department letter should include discussion of the nominee’s potential contributions as PGD and the nominee’s expected duties; comments about office space considerations could also be noted

5. Decanal and supplemental reviews
a. The department’s recommendation should be forwarded to the Dean, who will add his/her evaluative statement regarding the proposed appointment

b. The file shall also be reviewed by the Graduate Dean for comment

c. If the candidate will be participating in activities outside the home department, the candidate may request additional reviews by those units

6. Review by the Senate Committee on Academic Personnel

7. Review by the Vice Provost for Academic Personnel

8. Appointment by the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost

**Timeline for Consideration of PGD Proposal**

1. Academic Senate Executive Council general comments and suggestions
   a. February 22, 2010

2. Review and Comment by Senate Committees: Faculty Welfare, CAP, Graduate Council, and Educational Policy
   a. Due by April 1, 2010

3. Formal consideration by Executive Council
   a. Early April 2010

4. Formal presentation and consideration by the spring Divisional Meeting
   a. May 2010

5. Implementation target date: 2010-11 Academic year
APPENDIX A

5 November 2003

Berkeley Retirement Incentive Program
This memo supercedes the Council of Deans memo of 4 November.

Appointments as Professor of the Graduate School (PGS)

Retiring faculty who are fully engaged in research and who continue to contribute with distinction to the graduate program may be nominated for appointment.

Eligibility and Duties
- Faculty retiring in academic year 2003-04 may be nominated for an initial appointment of up to three years. Otherwise, appointments are for one year, renewable.
- Nominating deans and chairs should identify appropriate duties for each individual nominated. These include dissertation supervision, participation on orals committee, regular participation in graduate seminars, performance of administrative service.
- Continuation of the privileges of the title requires residence for the equivalent of one semester during any academic year. The title and any privileges will be discontinued if the residency requirement is not met.

Privileges
- Access to departmental support services extended to regular faculty.
- Identification in the campus catalogue and elsewhere as “Professor of the Graduate School” instead of “emeritus/a.”
- Authority to seek outside grants and serve as PI are the same for PGS as for regular faculty.
- In exceptional cases the Chancellor, upon the recommendation of the Dean, may allow a retiring faculty member holding an endowed chair to retain all or part of the income of the chair for the length of the initial PGS appointment or the end of the term of the chair, whichever comes first. Chair income may only be used for research expenses and the support of graduate students. It may not be used to provide summer compensation or any other form of income supplementation.
- PGS are considered to be “recalled” and have the departmental voting privileges.
of Emeriti/ae as established under Senate By-Law 55.D (3)

Criteria for PGS Appointment

Nominations for PGS appointment must be made by the department chair, accompanied by an affirmative departmental vote. The chair's nomination letter should describe the departmental value of the appointment and the nominee’s expected duties and activities. The nominations are reviewed by the relevant Dean and the Academic Senate's Committee on Budget and Interdepartmental Relations. Appointments are approved by the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Faculty Welfare.

Recall Teaching Agreements.

Arrangements to recall retiring faculty for teaching purposes may be made before the retirement date with faculty aged 60 and above. Multi-year agreements will not be considered binding, although an intention to recall for up to three years may be expressed. Recall appointments must be made annually, and must be based on programmatic need, budgetary capacity, and continued successful performance of duties.

The agreement must specify the course(s) to be taught and the rate of compensation. Compensation for recall teaching assignments is by agreement. In establishing the compensation for recall teaching, chairs and deans should be guided by the nature of the teaching assignment, the alternative cost of providing instruction, and the available financial resources.

Recall assignments may not commence until 90 days after retirement. However, if there is a compelling need for an earlier recall, the effective date of the recall must be at least 30 days after retirement or upon receipt of the first retirement check—whichever is later.

Financial Incentive.

For each faculty member who retires in 2003-2004, deans will be credited with $15,000 to be used in a manner agreed to with the retiree. Retirees need not be appointed as PGS to be eligible for this support, but they must be in residence and may not take other academic employment. The options include:

- A research grant, primarily to hire research assistants and otherwise support graduate students. PGS who continue to hold endowed chairs may use these
funds only to provide fellowship support to graduate students.

- Financial support of recall teaching appointments.
- Renovation of offices or other physical facilities appropriate to the transition from regular to emeritus/a or PGS status.
- A combination of the above.

Department chairs may discuss these arrangements, but approval for the use of funds will be made by the relevant dean.

**Space**

All issues of office and laboratory space must be arranged by the dean and/or chair. In doing so, the campus guidelines for emeriti/ae offices (available at: http://smcp.vcbf.berkeley.edu/policies/emeri.htm) should be followed.
LETTER FROM PROFESSOR DAVID LIEBERMAN @ UC-BERKELEY Nov 15, 2009

Dear Professor Norman,

My colleague, Chris Kutz, suggested I reply to your question about Berkeley’s Prof of Graduate School (POGS) program. I chair the Berkeley CAP this year. (I am not sure what materials you previously received from Mary Firestone.)

The program continues and continues to be successful. At the time of its initiation in the '90s, it formed part of a package of incentives to encourage faculty retirements. Then the package included various generous financial incentives. Under the current budget cuts, Berkeley (of course) has not had the means to offer financial incentives for retirements. But the Prof of Graduate School program continues to operate, and I know anecdotally that several faculty who have decided to retire have sought the appointment.

The Budget Cuts likely have had an indirect impact on the program in the following way. Many retired faculty in the program continued to do recall teaching, which was funded by temporary teaching budgets. These are under ferocious strain. I am imagine one way in which these faculty members previously were kept connected to campus - recall teaching - has been weakened and will continue to be so going for ward.

Finally, part of the appeal of becoming Prof of the Grad School (vs. Professor Emeritus) was that the designation kept the faculty member still competitive for outside grants. I am told by colleagues in the relevant disciplines that this goal was successfully realized.

Please let me know in case this fails to respond to your questions. I fear I don't have numbers for you, and worry if this is too impressionistic.

Yours,

David Lieberman
Boalt School of Law
UC-Berkeley
LETTER FROM PROFESSOR JACK KIRSCH @ UC-BERKELEY CONCERNING PROFESSOR OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL (PGS) (Dec 8, 2009)

Hi Tony,

Good to hear from you. Hard times have increased the popularity of the PGS program mainly because your 19900 funding is terminated when you are paid the UCRS pension.

All that is required for PGS status is that you contribute in some reduced way to the research, teaching and/or service to the University. Since retiring in ’06, I closed my own lab, but do collaborative research, which produces maybe a paper or two/year, I teach 15 undergrad lectures of metabolism/year and serve on 2-3 exam and promotion committees. This is good for me, as my brain atrophies a little more slowly. I am giving up the undergrad course after this year, but plan to keep other activities, so I expect my PGS status will continue. It really doesn’t cost the University anything to do this.

There is some advantage to continue teaching. I do get an extra $xxxx/year for my half course.

Best wishes for the season.

Jack

Kirsch, Jack F.
jfkirsch@berkeley.edu
Professor of the Graduate School
Department of Cellular & Molecular Biology
University of California
QB3 Institute
572 Stanley Hall
Berkeley, CA 94720-3220
510-642-6368
APRIL 26, 2010

TO: A.W. NORMAN, CHAIR
RIVERSIDE DIVISION

FM: D. HARE, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE

RE: PROPOSAL TO ESTABLISH THE UCR PROGRAM FOR PROFESSOR OF THE GRADUATE DIVISION (PGD)

The Faculty Welfare Committee generally favored the proposal and noted that there would be no cost to the Campus to establish this program. One member was concerned with the requirement that candidate faculty members should have undergone a merit review during the past three years and suggested that this may be a problem for some who might make a decision to retire on relatively short notice. Other members of the committee pointed out that the proposal allows for exceptions to this requirement. On balance, it is likely that the absence of a recent merit review could be adequately addressed by the candidate in his or her self-statement and the supporting departmental letter. One member also questioned the need for full annual reviews of Professors of the Graduate Division from the Department through the VPAP after the initial appointment. Review at three-year intervals may be more appropriate and would be consistent with the review of Full Professors.
March 31, 2010

To: Anthony W. Norman  
   Chair, Riverside Division Academic Senate

Fr: John Trumble  
   Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel

Re: Program for Professor of the Graduate Division

CAP voted unanimously to support the Program for Professor of the Graduate Division (+10-0-0-0).
April 28, 2010

Anthony W. Norman, Chair
Riverside Division
Academic Senate

At its meeting of Monday, April 19, 2010, the Graduate Council considered the Proposal to Establish the UCR Program for Professor of the Graduate Division (PGD). While the Council discussed possible pros and cons associated with establishment of such a program, they voted to support the spirit of the document.

Alan E. Williams, Chair
Graduate Council

AEW/vb
April 15, 2010

TO: ANTHONY NORMAN, CHAIR
ACADEMIC SENATE

FR: JOSE WUDKA, CHAIR
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATIONAL POLICY

RE: PROPOSAL FOR PROFESSOR OF GRADUATE DIVISION

The CEP considered the proposal to establish the UCR program for Professor of the Graduate Division. The Committee was supportive of the idea (9 Yes votes, 0 No votes, 0 abstentions). However, the majority were concerned about potentially unnecessary steps in the approval process; can this be limited to approvals by the Department, the Dean, then CAP, with further review by the EVC/Administration only in case there are discrepancies among these reviews?
# CHANGES TO BYLAWS/REGULATIONS

## REPORT TO THE RIVERSIDE DIVISION

**MAY 25 2010**

**To Be Adopted**

**Proposed Changes to Regulation 6 – Campus Graduation Requirement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRESENT</th>
<th>PROPOSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R6.13 (for undergraduates)</td>
<td>A student's degree may be deferred or withheld as part of the student conduct process for serious academic or non-academic violations, with approval by the student's College Executive Committee. No degree may be conferred on a student until any pending disciplinary charges against a student are fully resolved. The Dean of Students may place a hold on the student's records to prevent him or her from receiving a degree.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Justification:

At present the university does not have a policy that allows for deferral or withholding of degree. Students who are involved in serious violations of university policy in their final quarter of enrollment, academic or social, typically face no disciplinary consequences for their misconduct as they are able to complete their degree and leave the University before the disciplinary issue can be resolved. The Dean of Students and Director of Student Conduct & Academic Integrity Program propose amendment to Regulation 6 to provide a mechanism for the University to respond to serious violations of University policy in a student's final quarter in a manner that is parallel to the response with students who are at a different point in their academic career. Similar policies are in place at several sister UC campuses as outlined in the Appendix.

Approved by the Executive Committee of CHASS: 10/01/2009
Approved by the Executive Committee of CNAS: 10/01/2009
Approved by the Executive Committee of BCOE: 6/29/2009
Approved by the Executive Committee of AGSM: Date
Approved by the Executive Committee of the GSOE: 12/17/2009
Approved by the Committee on Educational Policy: (Received by CEP 4/21/2010; revised wording approved by CEP on 4/30/2010)

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording to be consistent with the code of the Academic Senate: Date

Endorsed by the Executive Council: Date
## APPENDIX
### Proposed Changes to Regulation 6 – Campus Graduation Requirement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus</th>
<th>Policy Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irvine</td>
<td>Campus policy allows us to revoke the degree, after the student has gone through the review process and if the academic senate concurs with the proposal to revoke. Nothing is held but records can be changed later if appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCLA</td>
<td>No degree may be conferred on a student until any pending disciplinary charges against a student are fully resolved. The office of the Dean of Students may place a hold on the student’s records to prevent him or her from receiving a degree.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Santa Barbara</td>
<td>It UCSB’s practice to hold graduation and degree but not an actual policy. Their attorney advises against revoking a degree that already is conferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berkley</td>
<td>Per website, an academic degree may be deferred when disciplinary proceedings are pending or when a student’s full compliance with disciplinary sanctions is pending</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
August 28, 2009

TO: Tony Norman, Chair
    Riverside Division

FM: Chris Switzer, Chair
    Graduate Council

RE: Proposed Changes to Academic Integrity Policy & Procedures

Graduate Council discussed the proposed changes to the Academic Integrity Policy & Procedures document at its June 12th meeting. The latest available document (dating from July 22nd) was distributed to the Council by e-mail on July 23rd along with a request for additional comments. This memo and the attached modified Policy document were e-mailed to the entire Council on August 26th. The latter e-mail requested comments on the documents, and meeting availability, by noon on August 28th (it was suggested in the e-mail that a meeting could be held on August 31st should any member indicate one were necessary); responses to the documents were received, and no Council member requested a meeting be held.

The Council suggests significant modifications to the proposed Academic Integrity Policy & Procedures. Due to the extensive nature of the suggested changes, the Council has incorporated them directly in the proposal document (which was created anew to enable this process without loss of formatting). The following sections of the proposed document have been recast: III. Administrative Actions. Courses-Procedures for Graduate Students (pgs 10-13); IV. Academic Integrity Committees. Graduate Academic Integrity Committee/Assessment of Academic Integrity by the Dean of the Graduate Division (pgs 18-20); V. Appeals (pgs 21-23); Misc. (pgs 3, 8, 9, 17 & 23). For most modifications, analogous undergraduate sections were used as a template with appropriate translations to the graduate educational circumstance as noted by red and green highlighted text (all page numbers refer to the attached modified document).

As an overarching principle, the Council feels it makes sense to apply the well-crafted text previously developed for undergraduates to graduate students in order to avoid the introduction of ambiguities. Additionally, the use of a parallel structure creates a more balanced, internally consistent, document.

Several concerns deserve discussion. The Council believes that the role of the Associate Dean of the Graduate Division needed to be better defined. A particularly problematic component of the document was seen in the dual role of the Associate Dean of the
Graduate Division in the (pre-)review of cases and as the Chair of the Graduate Academic Integrity Committee (non-voting status notwithstanding). The Council suggests that the Associate Dean of the Graduate Division conduct Administrative Reviews to determine whether it is more likely than not that the student is responsible for academic misconduct (subject to the same case provisions that apply to the Administrative Review of undergraduates by Student Conduct & Academic Integrity Programs, i.e.: cases that are not overly complex or serious/repeat violations), and not a pre-review for the Graduate Academic Integrity Committee. The Council has made revisions to the proposal document consistent with the latter suggestions. Further, the Associate Dean of the Graduate Division has been replaced in the role of Chair of the GAIC by the Vice Chair of the Graduate Council in the attached document. These revisions create three distinct entities for adjudication of alleged academic misconduct by a graduate student (although only two may be used by any single case due to the limitation to one appeal). Finally, with Council Members already committed to 2-3 Council Subcommittees in addition to the Council itself, their assignment to a further subcommittee -- the GAIC -- is not practicable (with the exception of assigning the Vice Chair of the Council to serve as the Chair of the GAIC). Instead, it is suggested that members of the GAIC be derived from appointment of at least one faculty member from each College and School by the Committee on Committees (in addition to two graduate students).
To be adopted:

PRESENT: 

Policy

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

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

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

PROPOSED:

Policy

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

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

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

Procedures

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

Procedures

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 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.
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 to the finding of misconduct.

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 in the case of an undergraduate or the Associate Dean of the Graduate Division in the case of a graduate student. 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 or a student may request the assistance of the Ombudsperson, a member of the Student Conduct & Academic Integrity Programs staff, a Graduate Advisor, the Associate Dean of the Graduate Division, or his/her designee 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 to the finding of misconduct.
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 Conduct & Academic Integrity Programs, the central location where all records of incidents of academic dishonesty are kept on file. It is essential that the form or referral memo include the student’s name and student identification number, the name of the class in which the act took place, the date or time period in which the act occurred, a description of the academic misconduct, a summary of actions taken, all original documentation supporting the charge, and the academic sanctions assigned.
C. In cases where the student disputes the facts upon which the charges are based, the instructor will refer the case to Student Judicial Affairs. The Academic Misconduct Referral form or memo must include the student’s name and student identification number, the name of 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 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 Conduct & Academic Integrity Programs for undergraduates or the Associate Dean in the Graduate Division for graduates. 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
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
Courses

A. In cases where the student does not dispute the facts upon which the charges are based, Student Conduct & Academic Integrity Programs, upon receipt of the Academic Misconduct Referral form or memo, 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 SCAIP, 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.

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 Conduct & Academic Integrity Programs 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.

The decision shall be forwarded in writing to the student within 20 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.

Courses—Procedures for Undergraduates

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.
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.

Whenever possible an Administrative Review will be scheduled such that both the faculty member and the student can attend. The purpose of an Administrative Review is to explore and investigate the incident giving rise to the appearance of academic dishonesty, and to reach an informed conclusion as to whether or not academic dishonesty occurred. In keeping with the ultimate premise and justification of academic life, the duty of all persons at a Review is to assist in a thorough and honest exposition of all related facts. A Review is not in the character of a criminal or civil legal proceeding. It is not modeled on these adversarial systems; nor does it serve the same functions; rather, it is an academic process unique to the community of scholars that comprise a University.

The review will:
* explain fully the alleged violation of the Standards of Conduct
* review written materials associated with the alleged misconduct
* give the student and the instructor the opportunity to present their accounts of the

Whenever possible an Administrative Review will be scheduled such that both the faculty member and the student can attend. The purpose of an Administrative Review is to explore and investigate the incident giving rise to the appearance of academic dishonesty, and to reach an informed conclusion as to whether or not academic dishonesty occurred. In keeping with the ultimate premise and justification of academic life, the duty of all persons at a Review is to assist in a thorough and honest exposition of all related facts. A Review is not in the character of a criminal or civil legal proceeding. It is not modeled on these adversarial systems; nor does it serve the same functions; rather, it is an academic process unique to the community of scholars that comprise a University.

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

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

The decision shall be forwarded in writing to the student within 15 business days of the review and communicated to the instructor, college and/or division in accordance with legitimate educational interest criteria as articulated by the 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 Conduct & Academic Integrity Programs 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 Programs.

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

The decision shall be forwarded in writing to the student within 20 working 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 Conduct & Academic Integrity Programs as to the question of misconduct.

In the event that Student Conduct & Academic Integrity Programs 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 Programs.
Committee in the instructor’s College, with the request that the case be resolved through a formal hearing.

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.

Courses- Procedures for Graduate Students

A. In cases where the student does not dispute the facts upon which the charges are based, the Associate Dean of the Graduate Division, or his/her designee, upon receipt of the Academic Misconduct Referral form or memo, will follow up with the student in writing to formally advise the student of the academic sanctions assigned by the instructor as well as appropriate disciplinary sanctions assigned by the University.

The decision shall be forwarded in writing to the student within 20 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 Graduate Academic Integrity Committee 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 or memo from an instructor, the Associate Dean of the Graduate Division, or his/her designee, will notify the student of the University Policy that was allegedly violated; the factual basis for the charges; 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 20 working days of the referral of the matter to the Associate Dean of the Graduate Division, 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.

At the Administrative Review the faculty member, the student and the Graduate Advisor will be interviewed by the Associate Dean of the Graduate Division. The purpose of an Administrative Review is to explore and investigate the incident giving rise to the appearance of academic dishonesty, and to reach an informed conclusion as to whether or not academic dishonesty occurred. In keeping with the ultimate premise and justification of academic life, the duty of all persons at a Review is to assist in a thorough and honest exposition of all related facts. A Review is not in the character of a criminal or civil legal proceeding. It is not modeled on these adversarial systems; nor does it serve the same functions; rather, it is an academic process unique to the community of scholars that comprise a University.

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

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

The decision shall be forwarded in writing to the student within 20 working 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 the Associate Dean of the Graduate Division as to the question of misconduct.

In the event that the Associate Dean of the Graduate Division 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 Graduate Academic Integrity Committee, 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

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.

In the Spring quarter, the Committee on Committees shall appoint 4 BCOE 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 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

**College Academic Integrity Committees for undergraduates**

An Academic Integrity Committee will be established in each of the Colleges to:

- hear cases referred by Student Conduct & Academic Integrity Programs that are sufficiently complex to require additional review
- hear serious and repeated violations of academic misconduct upon referral from an instructor or Student Conduct & Academic Integrity Programs
- hear appeals of decisions and/or sanctions imposed by an instructor or Student Conduct & Academic Integrity Programs

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.
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.

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 diversity within each College. The undergraduates shall be chosen from the undergraduate student body by the Associated Students of UCR. 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.

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

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

The Vice Provost for Conflict Resolution or his/her designee** will serve as a non-voting 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.

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 Conduct & Academic Integrity Programs 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.

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

Student Conduct & Academic Integrity Programs; 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

Graduate Academic Integrity Committee

A Graduate Academic Integrity Committee will be established for graduate and professional students to:

- hear cases referred by the Associate Dean of the Graduate Division that are sufficiently complex to require additional review
- hear serious and repeated violations of academic misconduct upon referral from an instructor or the Associate Dean of the Graduate Division
- hear appeals of decisions and/or sanctions imposed by an instructor or the Associate Dean of the Graduate Division

In the Spring quarter, the Committee on Committees shall appoint at least one faculty member from each College and School to serve a one year term effective July 1-June 30 (renewable twice). Two full-time graduate students shall be appointed to serve one year terms effective July 1-June 30 (renewable once). In all cases an effort will be made to appoint members who represent the disciplinary diversity within the University. The graduate students shall be chosen from the graduate student body by the Graduate Student Association of UCR and approved
A quorum of the Committee consists of four voting members, including at least one graduate student. In the absence of a quorum, the hearing will be rescheduled. Staff support to the Committee will be provided by the Academic Senate.

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

The Vice-Chair of Graduate Council 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.

The hearing procedures will be the same as for the College Academic Integrity Committees for undergraduates, and the Graduate Division will keep the audio record of the session.

Assessment of Academic Integrity by the Dean of the Graduate Division

The Dean of the Graduate Division will:
- review, on an annual basis, cases addressed through instructors and
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.

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

* new evidence not reasonably available at

the Associate Dean of the Graduate Division; provide oversight and direction and ensure that policies and procedures are appropriate and properly applied.

* hear appeals of primary/non-appellate decisions and sanctions of the Graduate Academic Integrity Committee

V. Appeals

At the undergraduate level, decisions of an instructor or Student Conduct & Academic Integrity Programs 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.

At the undergraduate level, 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.

At the graduate level, decisions of an instructor or the Associate Dean of the Graduate Division may be appealed to the Graduate Academic Integrity Committee. Appellate decisions of the Graduate Academic Integrity Committee are final.

At the graduate level, primary decisions of the Graduate Academic Integrity Committee may be appealed to the Dean of the Graduate Division. Appellate decisions of the Graduate Dean are final.

Appeal procedures are the same for graduates and undergraduates. 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

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 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 appellate entity is final.

The Committee or the Dean of the Graduate Division will make a decision based on the written submissions within twenty (20) business days, or indicate in writing what further process is necessary for final resolution.

The Committee or the Dean of the Graduate Division 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 Conduct & Academic Integrity Programs (undergraduate students) or the Graduate Division (graduate students), within twenty (20) working days after receipt of the appeal and related documents. The decision of the appellate entity is final.

VI. Maintenance Of Records

Student Judicial Affairs shall serve as the central location were 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.

VI. Maintenance Of Records

Student Conduct & Academic Integrity Programs (undergraduate students) and the Graduate Division (graduate students) shall serve as the central location where all written, audio 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 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:**

Here is a summary of why the changes are requested:

1) The revision from Student Judicial Affairs (SJA) to Student Conduct & Academic Integrity Programs (SCAIP) reflects the fact that our office name changed in Summer 2007 in consultation with the Academic Senate Chair and CEP Chair, among others, at that time.

2) We have inserted revisions that Graduate Division plans to take to Graduate Council to change the process for alleged academic violations for graduate students. The process as it currently stands does not seem to be working well for graduate student cases. Graduate students appear to be uncomfortable reviewing peer cases and we have had some difficulty recruiting graduate students to sit on the committees. Graduate Division feels their proposed model would work better.

3) The revisions of changed notification deadlines from 15 to 20 days is to move in line with a recommendation that we received from Audit & Advisory Services a few years ago and to be consistent with how we process non-academic cases. This will provide
more leeway for collecting information, processing cases, scheduling meetings, and coping with cyclical backlogs.

4) The insertion of a step under the appeals to include "The non-appealing party, whether student or instructor, will be notified the appeal as soon it has been received and be given an opportunity to submit a written statement for consideration during the appeal process." This has been recommended to be put in place to provide an opportunity for both the student or instructor to be heard (via in writing) during the appeal, not just one side. We have had faculty express concern that a decision was overturned by the Campus Academic Integrity Executive Committee (a final decision) based on information presented by the student in an appealed that they could not respond to. This measure seeks to "level the playing field" to a degree.

5) The other suggest changes are aimed a providing consistency with language in the document as minor corrections.

Approvals:
Approved by the Executive Committee of CHASS: 7/26/2009
Approved by the Executive Committee of CNAS: 10/22/2009
Approved by the Executive Committee of COE: 9/3/2009
Approved by the Executive Committee of AGSM: 7/23/2009
Approved by the Executive Committee of the GSOE: 12/17/2009
Approved by the Executive Committee of Biomedical Sciences: 7/13/2009
Approved by Graduate Council: 8/28/2009
The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording to be consistent with the code of the Academic Senate: Date
Approved by CEP: 1/15/10
Endorsed by the Executive Council:
July 22, 2009

TO: MARILYNN YATES, CHAIR, CNAS EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
    T. PATTERSON, CHAIR, CHASS EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
    FRANK VAHID, CHAIR, BCOE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
    JOHN HALEBLIAN, CHAIR, AGSM EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
    DOUG MITCHELL, CHAIR, GSOE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE
    AMEAE WALKER, CHAIR, DIVISION OF BIOMEDICAL SCIENCES
    DAN STRAUS, CHAIR, EDUCATIONAL POLICY
    CHRIS SWITZER, GRADUATE COUNCIL
    PIOTR GORECKI, CHAIR RULES AND JURISDICTION

FM: ANTHONY W. NORMAN, CHAIR
    RIVERSIDE DIVISION

RE: PROPOSED CHANGES TO ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY & PROCEDURES – REVISED

Attached for your review are proposed changes to the Academic Integrity Policy and Procedures. We had originally sent this out on June 2\textsuperscript{nd}, but some additional changes have been made. Replace the original with this one.

Please review and return your comments to me by August 31, 2009.
CNAS response for your suspense

From: Cherie Pierce [mailto:cherie.pierce@ucr.edu]
Sent: Thursday, October 22, 2009 3:46 PM
To: UCR Academic Senate, Sellyna Ehlers
Subject: Re: PROPOSED CHANGES TO ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY

Sellyna,
CNAS Executive Committee Approved this on 10/15/09. (I forgot to send it to you...so sorry!)
Cherie

At 04:32 PM 9/30/2009, you wrote:

Attached is a revised document for your committee to review.

Thanks.

S

Sellyna Ehlers

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

Thought for the day - Never look down on anyone unless you are helping them up!

Cherie Pierce

Graduate Graduate Advising Center Assistant
College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences
423 Pierce Hall

file://C:\DOCUME~1\sarah\LOCALS~1\Temp\eud6B.htm
To: Anthony Norman, Chair Academic Senate
From: Ameae Walker, Chair Biomed Exec Committee
Re: Revised academic integrity policy.

August 10, 2009

The Biomedical Sciences Executive Committee has reviewed the revised proposed changes to the academic integrity policy and has no further concerns. One suggestion would be to change the word “tape” on page 18 to “audio recording” such that it will not be necessary to revise the document once the technology changes.
FYI - for your suspense - I don't know how they could have met and discussed this so fast.

S

-----Original Message-----
From: John Haleblian [mailto:john.haleblian@ucr.edu]
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2009 9:29 AM
To: UCR Academic Senate, Sellyna Ehlers
Subject: Re: REVISED CHANGES TO ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY

Sellyna,

AGSM EC reviewed the proposal, and is in favor of the proposed changes.

Cheers,

John

--- Original message ---
> Date: Wed, 22 Jul 2009 15:12:52 -0700
> From: "UCR Academic Senate, Sellyna Ehlers" <sehlers@ucr.edu>
> Subject: REVISED CHANGES TO ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY
> To: <marylynn.yates@ucr.edu>, <thomas.patterson@ucr.edu>,
<frank.vahid@ucr.edu>, <john.haleblian@ucr.edu>, <douglas.mitchell@ucr.edu>,
<ameae.walker@ucr.edu>, <daniel.straus@ucr.edu>,
<christopher.switzer@ucr.edu>, <piotr.gorecki@ucr.edu>
> Cc: "Cherie Pierce" <cherie.pierce@ucr.edu>, "Gabrielle Brewer"
<gabrielle.brewer@ucr.edu>, "Rachael Easterling" <reasterl@engr.ucr.edu>,
"Sherry" <sherry.gonzalez@ucr.edu>, "Virginia Bustamante"
<virginia.bustamante@ucr.edu>, "Susan Stracener" <susan.stracener@ucr.edu>

> Attached for your review is a memo from Chair Norman
> for your committee.
>
> Thanks.
FYI

Original Message

From: tomcpat@ucr.edu
Sent: Sunday, July 26, 2009 11:34 AM
To: UCR Academic Senate, Sellyna Ehlers
Cc: gabrielle.brewer@ucr.edu
Subject: Re: REVISED CHANGES TO ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY

Dear Sellyna,

This look sfine to me.

Best wishes,
Tom
Thomas C. Patterson
Distinguished Professor and Chair
Department of Anthropology
University of California, Riverside
Riverside, CA 92521
For suspense

---Original Message---
From: Frank Vahid [mailto:vahid@cs.ucr.edu]
Sent: Thursday, September 03, 2009 9:25 AM
To: sellyna.ehlers@ucr.edu
Cc: Rachael Easterling
Subject: [Fwd: FW: REVISED CHANGES TO ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY]

Sellyna, the BCoE Exec approved the policy based on the understanding that the revision adding "memo" to the "form" submission means that professors can state in the memo that students admitted guilt, and this will be treated the same as if the student had signed the form admitting guilt. Of course, the student can always later appeal or change his/her mind, so there's no issue of "locking" the student in based on the professor's understanding.
But the starting point of the process should assume the professor's understanding is correct.

The addition of the word "memo" was not discussed in the revision's justifications, so we *assume* the above is what was intended. If NOT, then we would want that change added to the revision if the revision is to be approved.

Frank

-------- Original Message --------
Subject: FW: REVISED CHANGES TO ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY
Date: Tue, 1 Sep 2009 15:27:24 -0700
From: Rachael Easterling <reasterl@engr.ucr.edu>
To: frank.vahid@ucr.edu <frank.vahid@ucr.edu>

Dear Sellyna,

The BCoE Executive Committee has approved the revised changes to the Academic Integrity Policy. Attached is revised document BCoE's approval

Printed for Sarah Miller <sarah.miller@ucr.edu>
Hi Sarah-

I have heard from all the Executive Committee members and they are all in agreement and have approved the proposed changes to the Academic Integrity Policy and Procedures.

Thanks so much.

Maggie

Maggie Herrera
Executive Assistant to the Dean
Graduate School of Education
University of California
Riverside, CA 92521
951-827-5802

If you tell the truth you don’t have to remember anything
Mark Twain

From: Sarah Miller [mailto:sarah.miller@ucr.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, December 15, 2009 9:00 AM
To: doug.mitchell@ucr.edu
Cc: maggie.herrera@ucr.edu
Subject: GSOE Exec. Comm. response to Proposed Changes to Academic Integrity Policy & Procedures - Revised August 28, 2009

Dear Dr. Mitchell,

GSOE Executive Committee had a response due to the Senate Chair on November 30th regarding the Proposed Changes to Academic Integrity Policy & Procedures - Revised August 28, 2009. Can you please forward the response?

Thanks,
Sarah

Sarah Miller
Academic Senate Office
University of California, Riverside
231 University Office Building
Riverside, CA 92521
Phone - (951) 827-5538
Fax - (951) 827-5545
"Life isn’t about waiting for the storm to pass...
It’s about learning to dance in the rain"

Printed for Sarah Miller <sarah.miller@ucr.edu> 12/17/2009