AGENDA
GRADUATE COUNCIL MEETING
Thursday December 8, 2011
9:00 - 11:00 AM
ACADEMIC SENATE CONFERENCE ROOM
ROOM 220 UNIVERSITY OFFICE BUILDING

1. Approval of Minutes of November 20, 2011 Page 1-6

2. Announcements
   a. Chair of the Graduate Council
   b. CCGA Representative
   c. Graduate Student Council Representative
   d. Dean of the Graduate Division

3. Courses and Programs Subcommittee

   for Review:

   1. DNCE 280 (Colloquium in Current Topics in Dance Research)
   2. BIEN 235 (Vascular Biomechanics and Engineering)
   3. ME 255 (Transport Processes in the Atmospheric Boundary Layer)
   4. ME 273 (Principles and Designs of Micro Transducers)
   5. CS 213 (Multiprocessor Architecture and Programming)
   6. CS 203B (Advanced Computer Architecture)
   7. MCBL 262 (Seminar in Molecular Biology and Genomics of Disease Vectors)
   8. ENTM 262 (Seminar in Molecular Biology and Genomics of Disease Vectors)
   9. BPSC 290 (Directed Studies)

Program Changes and Proposals Page 7 - 12

   1. Revision to the Diversity & Equity M.Ed. Degree - GSOE
   2. Revision to the Autism M.Ed. Degree – GSOE
   3. Proposed addition to graduate program requirements – normative time
to degree - Biochemistry

4. Graduate Program Review Subcommittee

   a. Status Report Page 13
   b. Update on Economics Program Review

5. Fellowship Subcommittee Report

6. Old Business

7. New Business: Proposed Changes to Academic Integrity Policy at UCR
Present:

Kenneth Barish, Chair
Morris Maduro, Biology (Vice Chair)
Lynda Bell, History
Iryna Ethell, Biomedical Sciences
Gloria Gonzalez-Rivera, Economics
Connie Nugent, Cell Biology and Neuroscience
Ertem Tuncel, Electrical Engineering
Mike Vanderwood, GSOE
Jingsong Zhang, Chemistry
Joe Childers, Graduate Dean (ex-officio)
Gary Coyne, (Graduate Student Representative)

Absent:

Christopher Chase-Dunn, Sociology
Daniel Gallie, Biochemistry
Mohsen El-Hafsi, SoBA
Nosang Myung, Chemical Engineering
Deborah Wong, Music
Jennifer Wright (Graduate Student Representative)

Guests:

Approval of Minutes
The agenda was modified to include the letter to Dean Baldwin under “Old Business”. The minutes were approved as written.

Announcements:

Chair of the Graduate Council:
Chair Barish welcomed the new GSA representative, Mr. Gary Coyne. Chair Barish gave the following updates:
1. Chair Barish and Associate Dean Ken Baerenklau met with the Courses Committee on 11/16/2011. In general, the Committee on Courses may be receiving classes that are intended to partially or fully meet the new professional development requirement. They could be 200 level, 300 level, and/or 400 level classes. Most are likely to be 400 level. They will also be meeting with Executive Committees to discuss any issues they might have regarding the implementation of the Professional Development Requirement.

2. Chair Barish mentioned that the Division meeting will be held on Tuesday November 29, 2011 and that due to a faculty meeting, he was asked for a volunteer to handle questions regarding Council issues at the meeting if he had to leave. Morris Maduro volunteered to assist if needed.

3. Chair Barish also mentioned that the Policy on Student Conduct will be coming back to the Graduate Council for review again. The major issue with the policy will be the need to create a separate Academic Senate Committee to handle Graduate student disciplinary matters.

4. Our Executive Council discussed the Negotiated Salary Program at its meeting on November 14th, APM 668 and one concern raised was the impact on funding for graduate students and postdocs.

5. Lastly, Chair Barish mentioned that there will be no mid-year cuts and that the shortfall of $100,000,000 will be covered by the Office of the President if it is a one-time cut.

CCGA Representative: Prof. Mike Vanderwood indicated that the two issues discussed at the CCGA meeting were the Negotiated Salary Program and the impact on funding for graduate student support. The Task Force on Competitiveness in Academic Graduate Student Support was polling all the campuses to find out how graduate student support has been affected by the recent budget cuts. This information will be sent to UCORP as well.

Graduate Student Council Representatives: Mr. Coyne indicated that the graduate students had voted to approve the graduate student bill of rights.

Dean of the Graduate Division: Dean Childers provided the Council with the following updates:

1. EVCP Rabenstein has approved the Dean’s proposed funding for recruitment for next year. Letters will go out to programs next week.
2. Dean Childers obtained an additional funding of $50,000 to fund a client management resource from Hobsons. This tool will reduce the time it takes to recruit students.
3. In anticipation of higher graduate student fees, Dean Childers indicated that Graduate Division is looking for innovative ways to help faculty who want to hire graduate students. He indicated that UC Davis has a program that offers faculty a 25% buyback to those who hire graduate students, and UCR is
looking into the possibilities of doing something similar. If UCR implements the program, it will be predominantly for domestic students.

4. Dean Childers indicated that they are having problems creating data that is required for graduate reviews that his unit previously provided the Graduate Council. Computing wants to charge them and Dean Childers is negotiating with them, arguing that the data needs to be produced annually for all programs and that there should not be an additional fee added for producing the reports.

5. Dean Childers discussed GradPREP, the Graduate Professional Education and Placement Center that is run through his office. He mentioned that NSF and NIH have been requiring a mentoring component in their proposals and he wanted to spread the word to PIs that they could use GradPREP in their proposals to satisfy this requirement since one of the services offered is mentoring.

6. Finally, Dean Childers mentioned that he is looking for ideas about professional science masters that could either be self-supporting or not.

Courses and Programs Subcommittee: The following courses and programs were unanimously approved:

**Courses approved:**

1. EDUC 205 (School-Community Relations) – Delete  
2. EDUC 210 (Issues in Teacher Education) – Delete  
3. EDUC 221 (Technology in K-12 Education) – Delete  
4. EDUC 226 (Dimensions of Exceptionality) – Delete  
5. EDUC 231 (E-Z (Special Problems in Curriculum and Instruction) – Delete  
6. EDUC 235 (Classroom Processes) – Delete  
7. EDUC 236 (School and Society) – Delete  
8. EDUC 244 (The Student) – Delete  
9. EDUC 248T (Higher Education) - New  
10. EDUC 250 (Seminar in Education) – Delete  
11. EDUC 263 (Seminar in School Organization and Management) – Delete  
12. EDUC 273 (Urban Educational Policy and Politics) – Delete  
13. EDUC 275 (Teaching and Learning) – Delete  
14. EDUC 278 (Research on Online Teaching and Learning) – Delete  
15. EDUC 279 (Literacy and Technology) – Delete  
16. EDUC 297 (Directed Research) – Change  
17. EDUC 347C (Supervised Intern Teaching in a Special Class for Individuals with Moderate/Severe Disabilities) - Change  
18. MATH 297 (Directed Research) – New

Program Changes and Proposals approved:

1. Designated Emphasis in Book, Archive, and Manuscript Studies was unanimously approved.

Graduate Program Review Update:
**Spanish Program Review:**
Graduate Council discussed the responses from the Program and agreed to close out the review.

**Environmental Sciences:**
Vice Chair Maduro indicated that three reviewers have been identified and they are working to see if they can still conduct the review on February 27 and 28, 2012.

**Biomedical Sciences:**
Three reviewers have been identified and Chair Barish is trying to identify a date for the review.

**Fellowship Subcommittee Report:** The Committee received 5 applications, 1 from Engineering, 3 from CNAS and 1 from GSOE. They allocated $2,500 for fall quarter.

**Old Business:**
**CNAS Restructuring Memo:** Graduate Council reviewed the CNAS restructuring letter that was to be sent to Dean Baldwin and approved the letter so that it read as follows:

> The Graduate Council recently completed a review of the Graduate Program in Cell, Molecular & Developmental Biology, and many of the recommendations made by the external review team centered on structural issues within CNAS. This is not an isolated case, but rather a trend as similar recommendations have been made by past external review teams for other programs, particularly in the biological sciences. For example, in the review of the Environmental Toxicology (ETOX) program, the Graduate Council Findings and Recommendations noted “with great concern that, as an interdepartmental graduate program, [it] lacks the means to make faculty appointments, control space, and obtain financial resources to address its academic needs.” For the Genetics (GGB) program, the Council noted difficulties in staffing courses, asking that “the college administration give full teaching credit to participating faculty, which would reduce their teaching in their home department.”

> In light of the reorganization discussions in CNAS, we wish to bring these issues to your attention. Reorganization of the college or other policy changes is key to the future health of such programs, and the Graduate Council urges for these considerations to be central in your deliberations.

**Graduate Council Bylaws:**
Chair Barish established a 3-man taskforce to review the Graduate Council Bylaws and make changes for discussion by the entire Graduate Council. The members of the taskforce are: Ken Barish, Mike Vanderwood and Morris Maduro.

**Graduate Council Procedures:**
The draft Graduate Council procedures were accepted with the following modification to the template that was titled *Modification of Graduate Degree Program Requirements*, item no. 4:
If the desired proposed changes are to be inserted into the general catalog for the following year, they should be submitted as early as possible but no later than the end of the fall quarter.

**New Business**: There was nothing to discuss under new business.

Meeting adjourned at 10:55 AM
Connie Nugent, Secretary
Old Business:
**CNAS Restructuring Memo:** Graduate Council reviewed the CNAS restructuring letter that was to be sent to Dean Baldwin and approved the letter so that it read as follows:

The Graduate Council recently completed a review of the Graduate Program in Cell, Molecular & Developmental Biology, and many of the recommendations made by the external review team centered on structural issues within CNAS. This is not an isolated case, but rather a trend as similar recommendations have been made by past external review teams for other programs, particularly in the biological sciences. For example, in the review of the Environmental Toxicology (ETOX) program, the Graduate Council Findings and Recommendations noted “with great concern that, as an interdepartmental graduate program, [it] lacks the means to make faculty appointments, control space, and obtain financial resources to address its academic needs.” For the Genetics (GGB) program, the Council noted difficulties in staffing courses, asking that “the college administration give full teaching credit to participating faculty, which would reduce their teaching in their home department.”

In light of the reorganization discussions in CNAS, we wish to bring these issues to your attention. Reorganization of the college or other policy changes is key to the future health of such programs, and the Graduate Council urges for these considerations to be central in your deliberations.

**Graduate Council Bylaws:**
Chair Barish established a 3-man taskforce to review the Graduate Council Bylaws and make changes for discussion by the entire Graduate Council. The members of the taskforce are: Ken Barish, Mike Vanderwood and Morris Maduro.

**Graduate Council Procedures:**
The draft Graduate Council procedures were accepted with the following modification to the template that was titled *MODIFICATION OF GRADUATE DEGREE PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS*, item no. 4:

If the desired proposed changes are to be inserted into the general catalog for the following year, they should be submitted as early as possible but no later than the end of the fall quarter.

**New Business:** There was nothing to discuss under new business.

Meeting adjourned at 10:55 AM
Connie Nugent, Secretary
November 9, 2011
To: Dr. Morris Maduro, Chair
   Graduate Council
From: Margaret Nash, Associate Professor and Graduate Advisor
   Graduate School of Education
Re: Revision to the Diversity & Equity M.Ed. Degree
Revisions approved by faculty on November 8, 2011.

We are requesting that the completion of one of four approved University Extension certificate programs be eliminated as a requirement for admission to the Diversity & Equity M.Ed. degree, but still allow applicants who have completed one of these certificates prior to admissions to receive credit for up to 9 units towards the unit requirement for this degree. We are also seeking a change in the requirement that applicants have a teaching credential to be admitted to this degree. Finally, we are seeking a change in the overall unit requirements from 37 units to a minimum of 36 units.

Rationale for Revisions to the Diversity & Equity M.Ed. Degree

Currently, completion of one of four approved University Extension certificate programs (Reading; Reading with Biliteracy Emphasis; CLAD through CTEL; Education for the Gifted and Talented) is required for admission to the Equity and Diversity Emphasis M.Ed. Program. Students then receive credit for up to 9 units of 400-level certificate courses towards the 37 units required for this degree. The remaining 28 units are in 200-series courses offered in the GSOE.

The original rationale for requiring the completion of one of four approved Extension certificate programs prior to admission was that we believed local teachers who completed one of these programs would be interested in continuing their studies of diversity and educational equity and that receiving up to 9 units of credit towards the total 37 unit requirement would make pursuit of this M.Ed. degree desirable. While we still believe that this will appeal to many local teachers and so we would like to retain this as one option, we now realize that this also served as a potential obstacle to other applicants. Specifically, we believe – based on inquiries and applications to the GSOE over the past two years – that there is a potential pool of international applicants, especially applicants from China, who would be interested in this degree if not for the current requirement necessitating completion of one of four Extension certificate programs prior to admission. Additionally, students who have graduated from our Teaching Credential program would also be candidates for this professional degree program, but may find the Extension certificate program requirement an obstacle and therefore enroll in graduate degree programs at other institutions. We are asking for approval to eliminate the requirement that applicants must complete one of the four approved Extension certificate programs prior to admission to the Diversity and Equity Emphasis M.Ed. Program. However, we would also like to continue the option to count up to 9 units of credit towards the minimum 36 units required for this degree to applicants who have completed one of the approved Extension certificate programs prior to admission to the Diversity and Equity Emphasis M.Ed. Program.

In addition, we are also requesting to change the requirement that applicants have a teaching credential to “a teaching credential or equivalent teaching experience.” Our reason for this is that this broader requirement would include teachers at private educational institutions, public institutions with educational programs such as museums, and international students with teaching experience.

Finally, we are requesting a change in the unit requirement for this degree from 37 units to a minimum of 36 units. The original requirement was 37 units due to the inclusion of 9 units from Extension in addition to the required 28 units of 200-level GSOE courses. However, if this becomes one option in completing the Diversity and Equity M.Ed. degree, but no longer a requirement, then it makes sense to change the total unit requirement to a minimum of 36 units, which is consistent with our other M.Ed. Emphasis Programs. As a practical matter, this would mean that students not opting to count an Extension certificate program would
need 36 units to complete the program while students taking this option would graduate with 37 units completed.

GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
Change to the Diversity & Equity M.Ed. program

Current information on the catalog (strikeouts are deletion) Proposed changes in the catalog (underscores are additions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diversity and Equity Emphasis</th>
<th>Diversity and Equity Emphasis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This M.Ed. emphasis addresses the diversity in many K-12 student populations and supports teachers in achieving educational equity for all students through the translation of educational theory and empirical research findings into sound educational practice. It is a collaboration between the Graduate School of Education and University Extension and provides qualified students who have addressed issues of student diversity and equity in one of four Extension certificate programs (Reading; Reading with Bilingual Emphasis; CLAD through CTEL; Education for the Gifted and Talented) opportunities to explore and study equity and diversity in greater depth and breadth through GSOE coursework. Students receive credit for up to 9 units of 400-level certificate courses.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admission The following are requirements: 1. A teaching credential 2. Strong academic record 3. Letters of reference 4. Completion of one of four approved Extension certificate programs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Course Work This M.Ed. emphasis requires 37 units, 9 of which are in the 400-series professional courses offered by University Extension that satisfy requirements for one of four certificates relevant to equity and diversity. The remaining 28 units are in 200-series courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Diversity and Equity Emphasis
This M.Ed. emphasis addresses the diversity in many K-12 student populations and supports teachers in achieving educational equity for all students through the translation of educational theory and empirical research findings into sound educational practice. This program consists of a minimum of 36 units of 200-series courses offered in the Graduate School of Education. The program can also be completed through a collaboration between the Graduate School of Education and University Extension by completing one of four Extension certificate programs that address issues of student diversity and equity: Reading; Reading with Bilingual Emphasis; CLAD through CTEL; or Education for the Gifted and Talented. Up to 9 units of 400-level Extension certificate courses can be used towards the minimum 36 unit total required for this degree for applicants who have completed one of the four Extension certificate programs prior to admission to this program.

Admission The following are requirements: 1. Teaching credential or equivalent teaching experience 2. Strong academic record 3. Letters of reference from writers knowledgeable about the applicant’s ability to succeed in graduate study

Course Work This M.Ed. emphasis requires a minimum of 36 units. Applicants
who have completed one of four approved Extension certificate programs relevant to equity and diversity prior to admission can receive credit for up to 9 units of 400-level certificate courses. For these applicants the remaining 28 units are in 200-series courses offered in the GSOE.

Analytical Report Students will complete a final written project that addresses a specific concern or issue regarding diversity and educational equity in classrooms, schools, districts, or at the state or federal level. A final version of the project will be submitted to the Graduate School of Education and evaluated by faculty in the Education, Society, and Culture area.
November 9, 2011

To: Dr. Morris Maduro, Chair  
Graduate Council

From: Margaret Nash, Associate Professor and Graduate Advisor  
Graduate School of Education

Re: Revision to the Autism M.Ed. Degree  
Revisions approved by faculty on November 8, 2011

Rationale for Revisions to the Autism M.Ed. Degree

Currently, completion of one approved University Extension course (EDU X450.05, Curriculum Adaptation for Students with Autism) is required for completion of the Autism Emphasis M.Ed. Program, with an additional University Extension course (EDU X450.07, X450.02, X450.03, X450.04, X450.06) allowed, but not required for degree completion. The remaining 28-32 units of the 36 total units are in 200-series courses offered in the GSOE.

We are requesting to eliminate the required University Extension course (EDU X450.05), while still allowing this course and one additional approved course from the list above to contribute to the total 36 units required for this degree.

The rationale for initially requiring the one approved University Extension course (EDU X450.05) was that students interested in the Autism Emphasis M.Ed. would be enrolled in (or have recently completed) the Supplemental Authorization in Autism from the California Teaching Commission, which can be earned through courses at University Extension. Recently the California Teaching Commission reduced the course work required for this authorization, and many potential students for UCR’s program now complete this authorization through online options. This means that students who are now interested in UCR’s Autism Emphasis M.Ed. are less likely to have completed (or to be interested in completing) this particular course at University Extension.

We have sufficient courses related to autism available at UCR (e.g., EDUC 246E, J, K, L, M, and EDUC255A, 270) to fulfill the content of this degree without requiring the University Extension course. However, we would also like to continue the option to count up to 8 units of credit towards the minimum 36 units required for this degree to applicants who have completed one of the approved Extension certificate or authorization programs prior to admission to the Autism Emphasis M.Ed. Program.
## GRADUATE SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
### Change to the Autism M.Ed. program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current information on the catalog</th>
<th>Proposed changes in the catalog</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>(strikeouts are deletion)</em></td>
<td><em>(underscores are additions)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Autism Emphasis
This M.Ed. emphasis focuses on children with Autism Spectrum Disorder. A unique partnership between the Graduate School of Education and University Extension reflects a balance of research and theory from active researchers and relevant K-12 application knowledge from practitioners in the field.

### Admission
The following are requirements:
1. Teaching credential in general education or special education or admission to a UCR Specialist Level I Preliminary Credential program
2. Letters of Recommendation
3. Strong academic record

### Course Work
Required courses are offered in the Graduate School of Education, Summer Session, and University Extension. Some courses are offered only in GSOE, one course is offered only at Extension, and one course is offered in Summer Session. For some course requirements, students may choose from courses with comparable content in GSOE and Extension or Summer Session. A minimum of 36 units are required.

### Analytical Report
Students will complete a final written project that integrates the content of theory and teaching methods courses. A final version of the project will be submitted to the Graduate School of Education and evaluated by faculty in the Special Education area.
October 31, 2011

To: Kenneth Barish, Physics (Chair)  
Graduate Council

From: Dr. Daniel Gallie, Graduate Advisor  
Biochemistry and Molecular Biology Graduate Program

Re: Proposed addition to graduate program requirements  
Faculty voted to approve at meeting held on October 20, 2011

Present:  
**Doctoral Degree**  
*Normative Time to Degree* 15 quarters

Proposed:  
**Doctoral Degree**  
*Normative Time to Degree* 15 quarters  
In the case that a student changes the degree aim from MS to PhD, normative will be reset.

Justification:  
Most MS students admitted to the Master’s program in Biochemistry chose Plan II (Comprehensive Examination) which is a one year program that is essentially a professional degree in that these students desire admission into a professional school. Occasionally, a MS student will transfer into the PhD program prior to their graduation. Because they have missed an entire year of lab rotations and laboratory research, they are behind in their research when their Master’s year is counted towards their normative time. The addition of the proposed language is to address this penalty for such students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROGRAM</th>
<th>DATE OF REVIEW</th>
<th>TEAM REPORT</th>
<th>PRELIM. RESP.</th>
<th>PRELIM. RESP.</th>
<th>F&amp;R SENT</th>
<th>RESPONSE TO F&amp;R SENT</th>
<th>RESPONSE TO F&amp;R DUE</th>
<th>F&amp;R RECVD DUE</th>
<th>FINAL RESP.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVIEWS SCHEDULED FOR 2007/08</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Literature</td>
<td>Deferred to 2008/09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEOB</td>
<td>Deferred to 2008/09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>Deferred to 2008/09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10/1/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVIEWS SCHEDULED FOR 2008/09</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVIEWS SCHEDULED FOR 2009/10</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Writing &amp; Writing for the Performing Arts</td>
<td>Deferred to Fall 2009</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Art (internal)</td>
<td>May 21, 2009</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10/31/2009</td>
<td>1/25/2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>4/15/2010</td>
<td>5/7/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6/24/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVIEWS SCHEDULED FOR 2010/11</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Studies (Internal)</td>
<td>February 14, 2011</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6/1/2011</td>
<td>9/1/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asian Stud (Internal)</td>
<td>March 7, 2011</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>6/1/2011</td>
<td>9/1/2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroscience (Internal)</td>
<td>May 25, 2011</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>10/21/2011</td>
<td>1/21/2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REVIEWS SCHEDULED FOR 2011/12</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>Deferred to 2012/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>April 30, May 1, 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genetics, Genomics and Bioinf</td>
<td>Deferred to 2012/13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioengineering (internal)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sciences</td>
<td>Feb 27 - 28, 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entomology</td>
<td>January 12 - 13, 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 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)

| 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 | 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." |

### 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 credit for publications, training of research apprentices, requirements for record keeping of experimental procedures and data storage, and standards for meritorious 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.

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>Responsibile Body: Undergraduate Students</th>
<th>Responsibile Body: Graduate Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initiation of Cases</strong></td>
<td>Faculty member</td>
<td>Faculty member</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Faculty member’s suspicion of misconduct in a course, communication with
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Review Stage</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 1</strong></td>
<td>Initial [Administrative] Review Student Conduct and Academic Integrity Programs [SCAIP] Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs [Graduate Division]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 2</strong></td>
<td>Hearings for cases that are complex, egregious, and/or repeated cases of misconduct Academic Integrity Committees of each college/school [AICs] Hearing panels constituted from the AICs Graduate Academic Integrity Committee [GAIC] Hearing panels constituted from the GAIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stage 3</strong></td>
<td>Annual assessments of cases addressed at Review Stages 1 &amp; 2 Appeals of Campus Academic Integrity Executive Committee Graduate Council</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 student.
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 pre-meditation of the misconduct.

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

C. In cases where the student disputes the facts upon which the charges are based, the instructor will refer the case to Student Judicial Affairs. The Academic Misconduct Referral form or memo must include the student's 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 the review process.

Comment [S6]: Baerenklau – Suggest that faculty member appoint the immediate supervising administrator as a proxy: department chair, program director, center director, or dean of the school (but not college where there are departments).
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.

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
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.

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
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 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

[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,
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 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.

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

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

Comment [S10]: BCOE May be construed to
mean the ultimate decision for the grade is not made
by the faculty member but by SCAIP or Graduate
Division. If this is the intended meaning, does it
conflict with the faculty member’s academic
freedom?

Faculty are asked to submit grade to be assigned if
responsible and grade to be assigned if not
responsible on the Academic Referral Form. Once
determination of responsibility is made faculty are
advised and asked to submit the grade that reflects
the SCAIP or Grad Division finding. Decisions are
typically made in consultation with the faculty
member.

Comment [S11]: Baerenklau - Delete “by the
faculty member”
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 School 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 Academic Integrity 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 C.

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."

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 Academic Integrity Committee.

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.

Comment [S12]: Baerenklau – Suggest deleting last sentence about permission to withdraw if found not responsible. Subsequent to such a finding, the student returns to normal status which includes a procedure for requesting a withdrawal from a course but not the absolute right to withdraw regardless of circumstance as written here.
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)

comment 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 31. The final endorsement of student members will rest with the Committee on

Comment [S13]: Grad Division – Section is directed at undergraduate procedures so we need to remove any reference to graduate procedures.

Student Affairs welcomes the involvement of graduate students as part of undergraduate student hearing panels. Graduate student voices and perspectives are valuable.

Comment [S14]: Haerenklaai – The GAIC should have 10 members in the near future. Is this too large? What is meant by ‘or division’ in this paragraph? Should ‘or division’ be deleted?
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 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. 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.

For Graduates:

Comment [S15]: Baarenklau - How many students should be appointed to the GAIC? Should it be at least two?

Comment [S16]: Grad Division – Paragraph only applies to graduate procedures. Any reference to undergraduate procedures should be removed. Should be changed to 'Staff support to the committees will be provided by the Graduate Division.'

Comment [S17]: Biomedical Sciences: The Vice Provost for Administrative Resolution is a non-voting administrative chair for hearing panels for undergraduates. What if any is the role of the Associate Dean of the Graduate Division in hearings involving graduate students?

Comment [S18]: Baarenklau – No paragraph for graduates regarding chair and chair’s role.
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 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 violation of the University Of California Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline.

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.
E. 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.

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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>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.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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 undergrads and Associate Dean of the Graduate Division for grads 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</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment [S19]: Grad Division – The Associate Dean of the Graduate Division needs to be added. Also not quite sure who they want to send to. Notices for undergraduates are sent to the associate dean for student academic affairs of the student’s college and the dean of the student’s college.
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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Academic Integrity Executive Committee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>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</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outline the appeal process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V. APPEALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Appeals of Decisions by Faculty Members and/or from Review Stage 1:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. Review Stage 3: Annual Assessments of Cases and Appeals from Stage 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 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.

The Campus Academic Integrity Executive Committee additionally conducts annual assessments of SCAIP, GAIC, and Academic Integrity Committee actions for the

---

Comment [S20]: Baerenkalu – What is meant by ‘for each hearing’? This does not make sense in the context of annual assessments.

Comment [S21]: Grad Division – Do they mean that each year the Vice Provost will appoint an executive committee to review all cases for the year? I do find this very useful but I’m not sure how that ensures that policies are consistently applied if the decisions on the cases have already been rendered. The intention of the review is to allow the Executive Committee to provide guidance for the new academic year and to ask that responses be modified/recalibrated where appropriate.
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 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. Appeals 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 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 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

---

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.

Comment [S22]: Baerenklau – This paragraph applies to undergraduate students. The last sentence about dismissal of graduate students should be deleted.
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 business days.

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 been satisfied and whether further process is necessary to resolve the appeal. Findings of fact will be accepted as determined by the

Comment [S23]: Baerenklau – Suggest changing ‘may be withheld’ to ‘will be withheld’.
(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, 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 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 | 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.  
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 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 |
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.
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