AGENDA
GRADUATE COUNCIL MEETING
Thursday February 16, 2012
9:00 - 11:00 AM
ACADEMIC SENATE CONFERENCE ROOM
ROOM 220 UNIVERSITY OFFICE BUILDING

1. Approval of Minutes of January 19 2012 meeting  Page 1-8

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
   Attendance Sheet  Page 9

1. Approval of Courses - The following Courses have to be approved:

   1. BIEN 234 Orthopaedic Regenerative Engineering and Mechanobiology – New
   2. BIEN 249 Integration of Computational and Experimental Biology- Change
   3. CEE 249 Integration of Computational and Experimental Biology- Change
   4. CS 210 Scientific Computing - New
   5. ECON 207 Environmental Economics – Change
   6. ECON 210 (E-Z) Topics in Environmental Economics – New
   7. ENSC 210 (E-Z) Topics in Environmental Economics – New
   8. ENSC 211 Environmental Economics – New
   9. ME 221 – Advanced Dynamics – Delete
   10. ME 247 – Applied Combustion and Environmental Applications - Delete

The following Extension Courses have to be approved:

   1. MGT X200.01 – Strategic Management
   2. MGT X200.02 – Global Human Resources
   3. MGT X200.03 – Global Marketing Management
   4. MGT X200.04 – Multinational Financial Management
   5. MGT X200.05 – Managing Change and Technology

2. Program Changes and Proposals - The following programs need approval:

   1. Proposed additional to Biochemistry Graduate Program Requirements  Page 10

4. Graduate Program Review Subcommittee:
   a. Status Report  Page 1
   b. Update on upcoming reviews

5. Fellowship Subcommittee Report:
6. **Old Business:**
   Dean Childers – Conflict of Interest on dissertation committees

7. **New Business:**
   
   **Integrity Policy for Graduate Students**

   **Academic Integrity Policy:** Responses were received from CNAS, GSOE, SoBA, CHASS, BCOE, R&J, CEP, and Graduate Council. The SoBA, CHASS and GSOE Executive Committees approved the Policy as written. The remaining committees were not satisfied with the attempt to clarify the changes and CEP in particular noted that the intent of the proposed changes focused on two issues: the recruitment of members for Academic Integrity Committee (AIC) hearing panels, especially those held during the summer, and the removal of graduate student academic integrity reviews from the SCAIP office to Graduate Division, to be overseen by the Dean of the Graduate Division. They had no objections to these revisions, however, they felt that the Dean of Undergraduate Students should revert to the original language of the Academic Integrity Policy and make changes to that as necessary to implement the proposed substantive changes. Graduate Council on the other hand felt that the policy as written does not include graduate students and that it was inappropriate to have undergraduate students sitting on graduate review panels. The Chair of Graduate Council indicated that if there is no agreement on the revisions as proposed, then an attempt should be made to prepare another policy that deals only with Graduate Council. After further discussions, it was agreed that the Chair of Educational Policy and the Chair of Graduate Council would meet to formulate an appropriate policy and to include the Executive Committees of the Colleges in the discussions at an earlier point.

   **Self Supporting Program Joint Task Force**
Present:

Kenneth Barish, Chair
Morris Maduro, Biology (Vice Chair)
Lynda Bell, History
Christopher Chase-Dunn, Sociology
Mohsen El-Hafsi, SoBA
Iryna Ethell, Biomedical Sciences
Daniel Gallie, Biochemistry
Gloria Gonzalez-Rivera, Economics
Connie Nugent, Cell Biology and Neuroscience
Nosang Myung, Chemical Engineering
Ertem Tuncel, Electrical Engineering
Mike Vanderwood, GSOE
Jingsong Zhang, Chemistry
Joe Childers, Graduate Dean (ex-officio)
Gary Coyne, (Graduate Student Representative)

Absent:
Deborah Wong, Music
Jennifer Wright (Graduate Student Representative)

Guests:
Robert Clare, Physics

Approval of Minutes
The agenda and the minutes were approved as written.

Joint Administration/Senate Workgroup on Graduate Student Issues:
Prof. Robert Clare
Prof. Clare is a member of the Joint Administration/Senate Taskforce on Graduate Student support that was put together by President Yudof. The Taskforce’s charge is to evaluate the competitiveness of Graduate Student support, with a focus primarily on Ph.D students. It does not include professional schools. One proposal that has received a lot of attention, including from people such as Vice President Beckwith, is a high tuition model where students funded by grants receive a discount. The idea is that this could encourage more money in the system from sources such as foreign governments, foundations, and other fellowships, while at the same time not putting too much stress on research grants. Without a way to lower graduate student costs, research dollars from grants will be more likely to be spent on postdoctoral fellows. One question that the taskforce is dealing with is
exactly how much money comes from foreign governments and outside foundations versus what comes from the federal government. The committee has had difficulties getting information from UCOP on such student financials.

Dean Childers inquired about whether issues related to NRT are a discussion focus. He indicated that about 4 years ago, he had been informed that it would cost the system only about $7,000,000 to get rid of NRT entirely. With UCR’s relatively high international graduate student population, NRT is more of an issue for our campus than some others. Professor Clare indicated that UCOP is not concentrating on NRT at this time.

The three main themes that the Taskforce has identified and would like to deal with are:

1. UC financial offers are not competitive (there is variation among campuses);
2. UC accounting methods for payment of tuition negatively impacts teaching and research
3. The high NRT exacerbates the effect of high tuition

From the Graduate Student support perspective, a point raised was that the Taskforce also needs to look at non-monetary kinds of support such as health care and child care. Prof. Clare mentioned that he would bring this back to the members of the committee.

It was mentioned that some rebenching proposals could give financial incentives to increase the proportion of graduate students on some campuses, up to nearly 15%.

Announcements:
Chair of the Graduate Council:
Chair Barish indicated that EVCP Rabenstein attended the Monday January 9 Executive Council meeting and the bulk of the EVCP’s update was on the budget. It appears that the “one-time” 100 million cut to UC seems to be permanent, not one time. Chair Barish indicated that EVCP Rabenstein mentioned that in the Governor’s budget for FY12-13, there is another trigger that, if pulled, will result in an additional $200m budget reduction to the UC. The trigger is related to whether or not the Governor’s proposed revenue initiative fails. If the revenue initiative fails, it will result in about $15 million in cuts to UCR. In addition, the Governor’s budget proposes changes to the Cal Grants; in particular, it proposes increasing the GPA requirements for Cal Grants. There are two types of Cal Grants and the proposal is to raise one from 3.0 to 3.25 and the other one will be raised from 2.0 to 2.7. We have a very large percentage of students who receive Cal Grants and there is a possibility that this will negatively affect our students. The EVCP also discussed the issue of CNAS having an interim Dean, and needs to appoint a Dean who will be able to serve during the redesigning of the College of Natural and Agricultural Sciences.

CCGA Representative: Prof. Mike Vanderwood indicated that CCGA had a telephone meeting and that there will be a face-to-face meeting in February.
Graduate Student Council Representatives: The graduate student representative had a question as to why graduate students were removed from committees that review applications for incoming graduate students. Dean Childers indicated that University Counsel advised that because it was a privacy issue, it was not appropriate to have graduate students present.

Dean of the Graduate Division: Dean Joe Childers gave the following updates:

1. He was reappointed as Graduate Dean for another five years. The Chancellor and the EVCP have asked the Dean to use the Graduate Dean’s position to advocate for graduate education at UCR. We need to promote the Division and graduate education. Dean Childers also mentioned that he will be working with Mr. James Grant to feature a different graduate program on the front page of the UCR website every month. This will be a way of promoting what our graduate students are doing.

2. He also mentioned that applications for graduate students were up by 12% overall. Last year this time, we had 3700 applications, this year we have 4170. Foreign applications are up 15% and 8% for domestic applications. He also mentioned that the quality of students was very good with scores of 1580 for GRE and GPAs between 3.9 to 4.0.

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

Courses approved:

1. Approval of Courses - The following Courses have to be approved:
   1. BIEN 273 - Special Topics in Regenerative Engineering and Biomechanics - New
   2. CHEM 260 - Organic and Organometallic Methodology and Synthesis - New
   3. CHEM 263 - Analysis and Synthesis at the Chemistry-Biology Interface - New
   4. CPLT 212 - Introduction to Graduate Studies in Comparative Literature - Delete
   5. CPLT 216 - Semiotics: Literature and Culture - Delete
   6. CPLT 218 - Narrative Universals - Delete
   7. CPLT 271 - Narratology and Comparative Stylistics - Delete
   8. CPLT 274 - Representation of Science in Literature - Delete
   9. CPLT 286 - Interdisciplinary Studies - Delete
   10. CS 301 - Teaching Computer Science at the College Level - Delete
   11. CS 302 - Apprentice Teaching - Change
   12. CWLR 200 - Professional Fundamentals - New
   13. CWPA 297 - Directed Research - New
   14. DNCE 269 - Laban Movement Analysis - Delete
   15. ECON 209 Nonmarket Valuation and Environmental Policy - Change
   16. EE 215 - Stochastic Processes - Change
   17. ENSC 209 - Nonmarket Valuation and Environmental Policy – New
   18. ETST 243E – Special Topics in Ethnic Studies - New
   19. ETST 243F – Special Topics in Ethnic Studies – New
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Title and Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20. HIST 241</td>
<td>Readings in Asian History - New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. MCB 297</td>
<td>Directed Research - Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. ME 274</td>
<td>Plasma-aided Manufacturing and Materials Processing - New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. MGT 285</td>
<td>Field Colloquium - New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. MUS 265</td>
<td>Electroacoustic Music: History, Theory and Aesthetics - Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. PHYS 251</td>
<td>Techniques of Observational Astronomy - Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. PHYS 252</td>
<td>Topological Phases in Condensed Matter and Their Application to Quantum Computing - Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. PHYS 254</td>
<td>Statistical Physics in Biology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. PHYS 255</td>
<td>Spin Dependent Phenomena in Solids - Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. PHYS 257</td>
<td>Topics in Interacting Many Body Systems - Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. PHYS 259</td>
<td>Techniques of Observational Cosmology - Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. PHYS 260</td>
<td>Selected Topics in Theoretical High-Energy Physics - Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. PHYS 261</td>
<td>Theory of Strongly Correlated Low-Temperature Systems - Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. PHYS 262</td>
<td>Electron Spin and Magnetism Nanostructures - Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. PHYS 263</td>
<td>The Yukawa Sector Beyond the Standard Model - Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. PHYS 264</td>
<td>Strongly Correlated and Nanoscale Systems - Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. PHYS 265</td>
<td>DNA Computation - Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. PHYS 266</td>
<td>Theoretical Aspects of Fundamental Particle Interactions - Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. PHYS 267</td>
<td>Hadron Physics at Electron-Positron Colliders - Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. PHYS 268</td>
<td>Electroweak Physics at Electron-Positron Colliders - Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. PHYS 269</td>
<td>Physics and Electronics in Nanoscale Systems - Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. PHYS 270</td>
<td>Magnetic Resonance Techniques in Condensed Matter Physics - Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. PHYS 271</td>
<td>Heavy Ion Physics - Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. PHYS 272</td>
<td>High Transverse Momentum Physics at Hadron Colliders - Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. PHYS 274</td>
<td>Experimental Relativistic Nucleon-Nucleon Collisions - Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. PHYS 276</td>
<td>Experimental Aspects of Electroweak Symmetry Breaking - Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. PHYS 277</td>
<td>Special Topics in the Theory of Condensed Matter - Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. PHYS 278</td>
<td>Surface Sciences - Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. PHYS 279</td>
<td>Astrophysics - Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. PHYS 280</td>
<td>Space Physics and Astrophysics - Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. PHYS 281</td>
<td>Charge-Parity (CP) Symmetry Violation - Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. PHYS 282</td>
<td>Experimental Investigations of Strongly Correlated Materials - Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. PHYS 283</td>
<td>Techniques of Microscopy - Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. PHYS 284</td>
<td>Optical Techniques for Measurements in Physics - Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. PHYS 285</td>
<td>Experimental Technique in Particle Physics - Delete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. RLST 231</td>
<td>Ethnographic Methodology - New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. SOC 206</td>
<td>Proseminar in Quantitative Sociology - New</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. SOC 208</td>
<td>Proseminar in Qualitative Sociology - New</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following courses were not approved and were sent back:

1. PHYS 250 – Special Topics Seminar in Physics & Astronomy - New - Request that physics be asked to provide a better description of PHYS 250 that includes a list of all of the instructors and their specific special topic focus.
2. CS 210 – Scientific Computing - Request that a more detailed syllabus be submitted.
3. CWPA 254 - Request a more detailed course outline before we consider approval.

Graduate Program Review Update:
Microbiology Program:
Dean Childers indicated that the Microbiology Program that had previously been placed on a moratorium was doing well and that the program was admitting good students. It was indicated that an asterisk be placed next to the excel spreadsheet indicating that an interim review will be conducted in FY14-15.

Entomology Review:
Chair Barish indicated that the Entomology Graduate Program Review that was scheduled for January 12 and 13 went through with no problem. The External Review members were very positive about the Entomology Program but were concerned about the gender balance. They were also critical of some of the documents sent to them and suggested some modifications be made to the letter sent out to departments about to be reviewed. In particular, the departmental statement should not be limited to 2-3 pages and programs should be encouraged to present as much as they want.

Music Department:
Graduate Council discussed the responses from the Program and agreed to close out the review.

Religious Studies:
Graduate Council discussed the responses from the Program and agreed to close out the review.

SouthEast Asian Graduate Program:
Graduate Council discussed the responses from the Program and agreed to close out the review.

Fellowship Subcommittee Report: There was nothing to report.

Old Business: There was no old Business.

New Business:
Cooperative Extension Specialists as Sole Graduate Advisors:
Graduate Council discussed the letter from Prof. Parker, Chair of CNAS Executive Committee which referenced the November 19, 2009 decision by Graduate Council
to “allow either research series or adjunct faculty to serve as chairs of dissertation committees on an ad hoc basis and only where in those circumstances there is at least one Academic Senate member also serving on the committee.” After some discussion, the committee unanimously agreed to clarify the memo by saying that the policy does include CE/OP specialists, and agreed to retain the need to approve each case through Graduate Division on an ad hoc basis.

**Policy on Self-Supporting Graduate Degree:**
Prof. Vanderwood indicated that the purpose of bringing the UCLA policy to Council was to see if the Council wanted to develop a guideline for the UCR campus. Dean Childers indicated that there are various components that have to be considered when writing the policy and that it would be appropriate to form a joint administrative/academic taskforce to prepare a policy for UCR. After further discussions, Graduate Council asked the Committee on Courses and Programs to prepare a draft policy to be discussed at the full Graduate Council. This document will then be presented to the Administration with a suggestion that a taskforce be created.

In addition to the above, Dean Childers indicated that it was necessary to introduce two policies related to graduate students. The first one read as follows:

> Programs shall make every effort to review the results of candidacy exams when formally requested by students. Requests for review should be made within one month.

The above policy was unanimously approved.

The second policy which read as follows was not approved but was tabled until the next meeting.

> To avoid conflict of interest and the appearance of a conflict of interest, in those instances where spouses or domestic partners compose two-thirds of a dissertation committee, the committee is required to add at least one member, bringing the minimum size of the committee to four.

Meeting adjourned at 10:55 AM
Connie Nugent, Secretary
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COURSES AND PROGRAMS SUB COMMITTEE  ATTENDANCE SHEET</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MEETING DATE February 9, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Mike Vanderwood, GSOE, Chair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Lynda Bell, History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Mohsen El Hafsi, SoBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Gloria Gonzalez-Rivera, Economics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Deborah Wong, Music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Connie Nugent, Cell Biology and Neuroscience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Daniel Gallie, Biochemistry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Morris Maduro (Biology), Graduate Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Ertem Tuncel, Electrical Engineering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GUESTS
November 30, 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 7, 2011

Present:
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE MASTER'S DEGREE

II. Requirements for Plans I and II

A. Course Requirements

1. Biochemistry 102; Elementary Biochemistry Laboratory or research equivalent
2. Biochemistry 110A-110B-110C; General Biochemistry
3. BCH 184; Topics in Physical Biochemistry
4. Either BCH 210 or BCH 211 and BCH 212.
5. At least one advanced course taken from the Biochemistry 230 series.
6. Enrollment in General Seminar in Biochemistry 252 each quarter (when offered).
7. No more than 6 units of Biochemistry courses 240, 252, or 261 may be offered in fulfillment of the unit requirement at the 200 level
8. In special cases, where it is otherwise impossible to obtain the required number of 200-level graded courses, up to 4 units of Biochemistry 290 may be taken for graded credit. Approval of the Graduate Advisor prior to enrollment is required.

B. Other Requirements

1. A minimum of three quarters in residence.
2. Maintenance of a 3.00 grade point average overall as well as a 3.00 GPA in Biochemistry Department courses while in graduate status.

Proposed:
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE MASTER'S DEGREE

II. Requirements for Plans I and II

A. Course Requirements

1. Biochemistry 102; Elementary Biochemistry Laboratory or research equivalent
2. Biochemistry 110A-110B-110C; General Biochemistry
3. BCH 184; Topics in Physical Biochemistry
4. BCH 210, BCH 211, and BCH 212.
5. At least one advanced course taken from the Biochemistry 230 series.
6. Enrollment in General Seminar in Biochemistry 252 each quarter (when offered).
7. No more than 6 units of Biochemistry courses 240, 252, or 261 may be offered in fulfillment of the unit requirement at the 200 level.
8. In special cases, where it is otherwise impossible to obtain the required number of 200-level graded courses, up to 4 units of Biochemistry 290 may be taken for graded credit. Approval of the Graduate Advisor prior to enrollment is required.

B. Other Requirements

1. A minimum of three quarters in residence.
2. Maintenance of a 3.00 grade point average overall as well as a 3.00 GPA in Biochemistry Department courses while in graduate status.
**Justification:** Currently, those MS students choosing BCH210 (Physical Biochemistry) could potentially earn the MS degree having taken only two graduate level (didactic) courses in Biochemistry. This represents a limited exposure to the breadth of the discipline of biochemistry and graduates are thus hampered from an overly narrow focus in their training. Similarly, MS students choosing BCH211 (Molecular Biology) and BCH212 (Signal Transduction) lack exposure to physical biochemistry. Requiring that all MS students take BCH210, BCH211, and BCH212 will improve the rigor of the MS degree in Biochemistry without increasing the units required for the degree.
<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</th>
<th>F&amp;R DUE</th>
<th>F&amp;R RECVD</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></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>Creative Writing &amp; Writing</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>1/23/2010</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>for the Performing Arts</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 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>Neuroscience (Internal)</td>
<td>May 25, 2011</td>
<td>10/21/2011</td>
<td>1/21/2012</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 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>March 12 - 13, 2012</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>March 5 - 6, 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>
# ORDER OF REVIEWS FOR YEAR 2011/12 - 2014/15

## PROPOSED SCHEDULE FOR 2011/12

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Review Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Sciences (last reviewed Apr-2002)</td>
<td>March 12 - 13, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English (last reviewed Feb-2003)</td>
<td>Apr 30 - May 1 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioengineering (Internal - first review - Winter 2007)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entomology (last reviewed May-03)</td>
<td>Jan 12 - 13, 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Sciences</td>
<td>March 5 - 6, 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## PROPOSED SCHEDULE FOR 2012/13

- Anthropology (May-2004)
- Art History (Feb-2005)
- Genetics, Genomics & Bioinformatics (Jan-2003)
- History (May-2004)
- Plant Biology (Apr-2005)
- Mechanical Engineering (May-05)

## PROPOSED SCHEDULE FOR 2013/14

- Philosophy (Jan-06)
- Political Science (May-06)
- Management (May-06)
- Chemistry (Apr-06)
- Geological Sciences (Feb-06)
- Physics (May-06)

## PROPOSED SCHEDULE FOR 2014/15

- Management (MA/PhD - 2009/10) - Internal review
- Materials Science & Engineering - (MS/PhD - Fall 2010) - Internal review
- Critical Dance; Experimental Choreography (Mar-07)
- Education (May-07)
- Applied Statistics/Statistics (Mar-07)
- Computer Science (Nov-07)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/Program</th>
<th>Degrees</th>
<th>Start Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>MA, MS, PhD</td>
<td>1965-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art History</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classics</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>1998/99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Literature</td>
<td>MA, PhD</td>
<td>1965/1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative Writing</td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Fall 2002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance</td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Fall 2001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance History</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Fall 1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>MA, PhD</td>
<td>1961/1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>MA, PhD</td>
<td>1961/1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic Studies</td>
<td>MA/PhD</td>
<td>2008/09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>MA, PhD</td>
<td>1961/1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>MA, PhD</td>
<td>1964/2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>MA, PhD</td>
<td>1963/1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>MA, PhD</td>
<td>1962/1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>1963-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Studies</td>
<td>MA, PhD</td>
<td>2005/06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>1966/1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>MA, PhD</td>
<td>1964/66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast Asian Studies</td>
<td>MA</td>
<td>Fall 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Art</td>
<td>MFA</td>
<td>Fall 2003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>MA, MEd, PhD</td>
<td>1971-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>MBA</td>
<td>1982-83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>MA/PhD</td>
<td>2009/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical Sciences</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>1987/88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied Stat/Statistics</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1978/1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biochem &amp; Mol Biol</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1963-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evolution, Ecology &amp; Org</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1964-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botany/Plant Biology</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1961-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell, Mol, Dev Biol</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>Fall 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>Degree(s)</td>
<td>Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemistry</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1960-61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entomology</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1961-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Science</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1999-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environ Toxicology</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1987-88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genetics, Genomics &amp; B</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>1971-72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geological Sciences</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1961-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>MA, MS, PhD</td>
<td>1961/1962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Microbiology</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroscience</td>
<td>PhD</td>
<td>Fall 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1960/61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plant Pathology</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1961-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil &amp; Water Science</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1961-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bioengineering</td>
<td>MS/PhD</td>
<td>Winter 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chem &amp; Env Eng</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>Fall 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Science</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>1981/1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Eng</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>Winter 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Science &amp; Eng</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>Fall 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical Eng</td>
<td>MS, PhD</td>
<td>Fall 2001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Proposed Changes to
Academic Integrity at the University of California, Riverside:
Policies for Graduate Students and Post-Doctoral Researchers

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."

1. **Requirements and Expectations in Research**

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

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

2. **Allegations of Misconduct in Research**

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

The Vice Chancellor for Research or his/her designee will review the description of the 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, beginning with Review Stage 1.

3. Requirements and Expectations in Courses

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

4. Allegations of Misconduct in Courses

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible Body</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initiation of Cases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communication with the student regarding suspected misconduct and documentation of actions via the Graduate Academic Misconduct Referral Form</td>
<td>Faculty member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Stage 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Initial [Administrative] Review</td>
<td>Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Stage 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hearings for cases that are complex, egregious, and/or repeated cases of misconduct</td>
<td>Graduate Academic Integrity Committee [GAIC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Appeals of decisions made at Review Stage 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Stage 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Annual assessments of cases addressed at Review Stages 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td>Graduate Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Appeals of primary decisions made at Review Stage 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.1 Initiation of Cases

If a Faculty member suspects that an act of academic misconduct has occurred in a course, he or she must promptly communicate with the student regarding the alleged misconduct and the information upon which the allegation is based; the notification process must occur within 30 calendar days from the discovery of the alleged act. The Faculty member may make a request for an extension of time through the 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’s University e-mail address.

The student must be given the opportunity to respond to the allegation of misconduct. When communication is made in writing, students will be given 10 calendar days to respond.

After conferring with the student and/or considering the student’s written response, the Faculty member may determine that there has been no misconduct, in which case the Faculty member may dismiss the allegation and take no further action.

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

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

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

If the student admits responsibility for the alleged misconduct, the Faculty member may immediately impose an appropriate sanction. The faculty member will document the case and the sanction on the Graduate Academic Misconduct Referral form and send the form to the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs.

4.1.2 Student Does Not Admit Responsibility

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

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

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

4.2 Review Stage 1: Initial [Administrative] Review

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

4.2.1 Outcome of the Initial [Administrative] Review

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

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

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

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

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

Review Stage 2 is reserved for cases involving a student with a record of previous academic misconduct or cases that are sufficiently complex or egregious to require additional consultation by the Graduate Academic Integrity Committee [GAIC] for a formal hearing. Review Stage 2 also serves as the stage for appeals of decisions made at Review Stage 1. Appellate decisions at Review Stage 2 are final.
The Academic Senate’s Committee on Committees will appoint faculty to the Graduate Academic Integrity Committee to serve one-year terms, effective September 1-August 31, and will appoint one faculty member from the GAIC to serve as chair. The GAIC will consist of at least one member from each school and at least two members from each college and should include faculty who are available to participate in hearing during the summer months.

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

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

4.3.1 Hearing Panels

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

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

4.3.2 Hearing Procedures

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

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

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

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

5. Determination of sanctions: If the student is found to be responsible for violations of policies, the hearing panel shall be informed of the student's prior record of academic misconduct. Based on this information, 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.

6. Notification of decision: Once the hearing panel has reached a decision, the parties will reassemble, and the results of the deliberation will be presented. Within 20 calendar days, the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs will send written notification to the student, the Faculty member, and the dean or his/her designated associate dean for student academic affairs of the college/school detailing the decision and the sanctions imposed by the hearing panel. The notification will also outline the appeal process.

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

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

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

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

5. Appeals

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

5.1 Criteria for Appeals

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

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

5.2 Appeal Procedures

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

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

4. When an appeal has been filed, the relevant parties may be requested to respond in writing to the matters in question before a decision about the appeal is made. The non-appealing party, whether student or Faculty member, will be notified of the appeal 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.

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

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

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

6. Maintenance of Records

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

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

**JUSTIFICATION:**

The proposed policy moves responsibility for adjudication of alleged academic misconduct by graduate students from the Academic Integrity Committees of the Colleges and Schools (i.e., SCAIP) to the Graduate Division and Graduate Council. Enabling changes have been made to the existing academic integrity policy to indicate separate processes for undergraduate and graduate academic misconduct investigations and hearings.

There are several rationales for this policy change. First, SCAIP has a large caseload of mostly undergraduate cases. Therefore both undergraduate and graduate cases could be adjudicated more efficiently by off-loading the graduate caseload and allowing SCAIP to focus on the undergraduate cases. SCAIP is supportive of this new workload allocation. Second, there have been instances in the past where graduate student cases were heard by committees comprised of faculty and undergraduate students, apparently because graduate students were unavailable for the hearing. Although this has happened infrequently, the Graduate Council finds it to be inappropriate. Under the proposed policy, such situations will be avoided. Third, the Graduate Council believes that graduate students should be held to different (higher) academic integrity standards than undergraduate students, but some graduate cases have been adjudicated in ways that seem excessively lenient. This may be due to the “anchoring effect” created by the vast majority of conduct cases being undergraduate cases. By separating graduate from undergraduate cases, both hearing processes will produce outcomes that are more appropriate for and consistent within their respective constituencies. Fourth, the current policy limits the ability of the Graduate Dean, who is ultimately responsible for graduate academic affairs, to oversee graduate academic integrity. The current policy provides very little scope for the Graduate Dean to modify a conduct decision unless it is a recommendation for dismissal. Because very few cases result in recommendations for dismissal, the currently policy has effectively moved a very important aspect of graduate academic affairs out of the Graduate Dean’s office.

**APPROVALS:**

Approved by Graduate Council:
Approved by the Committee on Academic Freedom:
Approved by the Committee on Educational Policy:
The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction finds the wording to be consistent with the code of the Academic Senate:
Reviewed by the Executive Council:
Proposed Changes to Academic Integrity at the University of California, Riverside:

Policies for Graduate Students and Post-Doctoral Researchers

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."

1. Requirements and Expectations in Research

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

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

2. Allegations of Misconduct in Research

All allegations of research misconduct should be immediately reported to the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs in the Graduate Division. The Associate Dean will then inform the Vice Chancellor for Research who serves as the UCR Research Integrity Officer and who, in furtherance of the University’s obligations and responsibilities, has been delegated the administrative authority by the Chancellor with respect to the oversight, implementation, maintenance and updating of the Policy and Procedures for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct at the University Of California, Riverside. All complainants should consult the Policy and Procedures for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct at the University Of California, Riverside prior to bringing an allegation of research misconduct to the Associate Dean.
The Vice Chancellor for Research or his/her designee will review the description of the 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, beginning with Review Stage 1.

3. Requirements and Expectations: in Courses

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

4. Allegations of Misconduct in Courses

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Responsible Body</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Initiation of Cases</strong></td>
<td>Faculty member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Communication with the student regarding suspected misconduct and documentation of actions via the Graduate Academic Misconduct Referral Form for Review Stage 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review Stage 1</strong></td>
<td>Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs [Graduate Division]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Initial [Administrative] Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review Stage 2</strong></td>
<td>Graduate Academic Integrity Committee [GAIC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Hearings for cases that are complex, egregious, and/or repeated cases of misconduct</td>
<td>Hearing panels constituted from the GAIC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Appeals of decisions made at Review Stage 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review Stage 3</strong></td>
<td>Graduate Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Annual assessments of cases addressed at Review Stages 1 &amp; 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Appeals of primary decisions made at Review Stage 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
42.1 Initiation of Cases

If a Faculty member suspects that an act of academic misconduct has occurred in a course, he or she must promptly communicate with the student regarding the alleged misconduct and the information upon which the allegation is based; the notification process must occur within 30 calendar days from the discovery of the alleged act. The Faculty member may make a request for an extension of time through the 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’s University e-mail address.

The student must be given the opportunity to respond to the allegation of misconduct. When communication is made in writing, students will be given 10 calendar days to respond.

After conferring with the student and/or considering the student’s written response, the Faculty member may determine that there has been no misconduct, in which case the Faculty member may dismiss the allegation and take no further action.

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

Faculty members who will not be available to participate fully in resolving allegations (e.g., Individuals holding part-time or temporary appointments, those on sabbatical or other leave, or those leaving University employment) must provide a copy of all documentation to the immediate supervising administrator: department chair, program director, center director, or dean of school, who will serve as a proxy for the Faculty member to conclude the case.
If grades are awarded while the case is in progress, the Faculty member should assign a temporary grade placeholder of Grade Delay “GD” pending the outcome of the review process.

### 4.1.1 Student Admits Responsibility

If the student admits responsibility for the alleged misconduct, the Faculty member may immediately impose an appropriate sanction. The faculty member will document the case and the sanction on the Graduate Academic Misconduct Referral form and send the form to the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs.

### 4.1.2 Student Does Not Admit Responsibility

If the student does not admit responsibility but the Faculty member makes a determination of misconduct, based on facts that the accused student disputes:

The Faculty member will refer the case to SCAIP [or Graduate Division for graduate students] the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs using the Graduate Academic Misconduct Referral Form. The referral form must include the student's name and student identification number, the name of the class in which the act took place, the date or time period in which the act occurred, a description of the academic misconduct, a summary of actions taken, all original documentation supporting the charge (including a copy of the course syllabus and other written communication that addresses academic integrity standards and expectations for the course) and the academic actions and administrative sanctions recommended by the Faculty member.

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

Upon receipt of the Academic Misconduct Referral Form, SCAIP [or Graduate Division for graduate students] the Associate Dean for Graduate Academic Affairs will notify the student of the University of California Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline that was allegedly violated, the factual basis for the charges, and the plan to conduct an Initial [Administrative] Review of the case. The student will be advised that the Initial [Administrative] Review is intended as a thorough exposition of all related facts and written materials associated with the alleged misconduct, and that it is not intended as an adversarial criminal or civil legal proceeding. The student will also be informed of his or her right to be assisted by an advisor of his or her choice. Such written notification will occur within 20 calendar days of the receipt of the referral by SCAIP [or Graduate Division for graduate students] the Associate Dean and will be sent to the student’s University e-mail address.
4.2 Review Stage 1: Initial [Administrative] Review process:

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

4.2.1b. Outcome of the Initial [Administrative] Review:

If SCAIP [or Graduate Division for graduate students] the Associate Dean determines that it is more likely than not that the student is responsible for academic misconduct, the academic actions recommended by the Faculty member, as well as any disciplinary-administrative sanctions imposed by the University, will be assigned.

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

3. Cases involving a student with a record of previous academic misconduct or cases that are sufficiently complex to require additional consultation shall be referred directly by SCAIP [or Graduate Division for graduate students] the Associate Dean 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 for a violation of academic integrity that affects the course grade will be applied. If the student is found not responsible for academic
misconduct, the student will be permitted to withdraw from the course in accordance with campus regulations.

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

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 or egregious to require additional consultation by the Academic Integrity Committee in the relevant college/school or to the Graduate Academic Integrity Committee [GAIC] for a formal hearing. Review Stage 2 also serves as the stage for appeals of decisions made at Review Stage 1. Appellate decisions at Review Stage 2 are final.

### 4.3.1 College/School Academic Integrity Committees for Cases Involving Undergraduate Students

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

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

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

### 4.3.2 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 Committees. Students are not eligible to serve if they have been suspended or are on academic or disciplinary probation, have been evicted from University Housing for reasons related to conduct, or have a case pending before the Graduate Division, GAIC, or Graduate Council.

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

3.4.3.1 Hearing Panels

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

For undergraduates, the Vice Provost for Administrative Resolution or his/her designee will serve as a non-voting, administrative chair of the hearing panel to facilitate the hearing. For graduate students, the Associate Dean or designee will serve as a non-voting administrative chair of the hearing panel. The chair of the hearing panel shall rule on all questions of procedure and evidence, including but not limited to: the order of presentation of evidence, admissibility of evidence, applicability of regulations to a particular case, and relevance of testimony.

4.3.2 Hearing Procedures

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

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

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

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

5. Determination of sanctions: If the student is found to be responsible for violations of policies, the hearing panel shall be informed of the student’s prior record of academic misconduct. Based on this information, 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.

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

7. Records: An audio recording of the hearing, but not the deliberations of the hearing panel, shall be made and retained by 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 46 below). The student may obtain a copy of the recording upon paying the expense of making such copy. Either party may arrange for a
stenographer to make a full transcript of the proceedings at his/her own expense. If one party has the proceedings transcribed, arrangements shall be made before the hearing as to how to apportion the cost if both parties want copies. Other than for the purpose of the official record as provided above, mechanical or electronic devices for recording or broadcasting shall be excluded from the hearing.

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

Review Stage 3 is reserved for appeals of primary decisions made at Review Stage 2, and for annual assessment of cases adjudicated at Review Stages 1 and 2. The Academic Integrity Executive Committee for undergraduates will serve in this role for the purpose of providing oversight and ensuring that policies and procedures are appropriately and consistently applied.

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

The Campus Academic Integrity Executive Committee and Graduate Council additionally conduct annual assessments of SCAIP, GAIC, and Academic Integrity Committee actions cases adjudicated at Review Stages 1 and 2 for the purpose of providing oversight and ensuring that policies and procedures are appropriately and consistently applied.

5. Appeals

Decisions of 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 time of the original hearing, the absence of which can be shown to have had a detrimental impact on the outcome of the hearing

Comment [KB8]: Suggest 3-5 faculty serve on this committee.

Comment [KB9]: Needs additional brief description, at least providing the composition of the group that will conduct the review (e.g., 3-5 members of the Council).
* 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 appeal committee is final. Appeals of Decisions by Faculty Members and/or from Review Stage 1:

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

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

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

5.12. Criteria for Appeals

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

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

5.23. Appeal Procedures

1. The Faculty member or the student may appeal a decision in writing to the appropriate body for appeal, as described above. The appeal must be made within 10 calendar days after the written decision is made available.

2. Appeals must be authored and signed by the submitting party. Appeals produced by advisors or other non-parties will not be considered.

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

4. When an appeal has been filed, the relevant parties may be requested to respond in writing to the matters in question before a decision about the appeal is made. The non-appealing party, whether student or Faculty member, will be notified of the appeal as soon as it has been received by the appropriate appellate body and will be given an opportunity to submit a

Comment [KB10]: Suggest providing a deadline here, such as within 10 calendar days.
written statement for consideration during the appeal process.

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

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

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

VI. MAINTENANCE OF RECORDS

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 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.

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 seven years from the date of the letter providing notice of final disciplinary action, unless otherwise determined by the Vice Provost for Conflict Resolution. When a student is suspended as a result of a violation of the University of California Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline, the fact that suspension was imposed must be posted on the academic transcript for the duration of the suspension. When a student is dismissed, the fact that dismissal was imposed must be posted on the academic transcript permanently.

**JUSTIFICATION:**

The proposed policy moves responsibility for adjudication of alleged academic misconduct by graduate students from the Academic Integrity Committees of the Colleges and Schools (i.e., SCAIP) to the Graduate Division and Graduate Council. Enabling changes have been made to the existing academic integrity policy to indicate separate processes for undergraduate and graduate academic misconduct investigations and hearings.

There are several rationales for this policy change. First, SCAIP has a large caseload of mostly undergraduate cases. Therefore both undergraduate and graduate cases could be adjudicated more efficiently by off-loading the graduate caseload and allowing SCAIP to focus on the undergraduate cases. SCAIP is supportive of this new workload allocation. Second, there have been instances in the past where graduate student cases were heard by committees comprised of faculty and undergraduate students, apparently because graduate students were unavailable for the hearing. Although this has happened infrequently, the Graduate Council finds it to be inappropriate. Under the proposed policy, such situations will be avoided. Third, the Graduate Council believes that graduate students should be held to different (higher) academic integrity standards than undergraduate students, but some graduate cases have been adjudicated in ways that seem excessively lenient. This may be due to the “anchoring effect” created by the vast majority of conduct cases being undergraduate cases. By separating graduate from undergraduate cases, both hearing processes will produce outcomes that are more appropriate for and consistent within their respective constituencies. Fourth, the current policy limits the ability of the Graduate Dean, who is ultimately responsible for graduate academic affairs, to oversee graduate academic integrity. The current policy provides very little scope for the Graduate Dean to modify a conduct decision unless it is a recommendation for dismissal. Because very few cases result in recommendations for dismissal, the currently policy has effectively moved a very important aspect of graduate academic affairs out of the Graduate Dean’s office.
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