



Academic Senate

July 14, 2020

To: Stefano Vidussi, Chair
Committee on Educational Policy

From: Dylan Rodriguez, Chair
Riverside Division

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "DR", is written over the name "Dylan Rodriguez" in the "From:" field.

Re: Interpretation of Academic Integrity Appendices

Dear Stefano:

I thank the Committee on Educational Policy for inquiring about this matter, especially given the stress created by COVID-19 on our teaching mission. You will see that the Committee on Rules & Jurisdiction has provided a direct response regarding the Senate's purview over these particular academic integrity matters. While R&J suggests that the Senate reach out to campus counsel for further clarification, I do not think this is the best approach. Rather, I think SCAIP should take the initiative to consult with campus counsel if it deems such consultation necessary. It seems clear that CEP's interpretation is sound and consistent within the Senate's regulatory perspective. Any further consultation on this issue from campus counsel will be considered, but it ought not be initiated by the Senate in this case.


I understand that CEP is considering publishing an FAQ that offers guidance to UCR instructors regarding the context of academic integrity appendices under emergency remote teaching conditions. I support this effort if CEP deems it appropriate, and would only emphasize that any such FAQ should stress that the Senate appendices remain in place.

Peace
dylan



June 9, 2020

To: Dylan Rodríguez, Chair
Riverside Division

From: Stefano Vidussi, Chair 
Committee on Educational Policy

Re: Interpretation of Academic Integrity Appendices

The Committee on Educational Policy has corresponded with Student Conduct and Academic Integrity Programs (SCAIP) regarding concerns that academic integrity cases have increased since instruction was moved to a remote format in March 2020. SCAIP has recommended that the Academic Integrity regulations found in Appendix 6 of the Academic Senate Bylaws be clarified. The Committee has drafted the attached document that seeks to provide clarity and guidance to faculty and have requested that the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction and any other Committees that you deem relevant review the document.

Preamble

Academic Integrity is a founding principle of our community and as such encompasses all aspects of Campus activity. Observance of existing regulations, on behalf of all faculty and students, contributes to ensuring respect for the truthfulness of the academic work carried at UCR.

Academic Integrity, at UCR, is regulated by Appendix 6 of the Academic Senate Bylaws (approved by Educational Policy on April 2, 2012, after consultation with the Graduate Council, amended on May 29, 2012). In the following we wish to issue some guidance and clarification regarding the interpretation of parts of that policy. A pressing issue that requires such guidance is that over time, due to changes in the technologies used in the delivery of education, there has been a growth in incidence of alleged “mass misconduct” incidents, i.e. incidents that involve multiple individuals. We want to clarify how, within the realm of existing regulations, the language should be interpreted. The purpose is to make sure that due process takes place, faculty and staff are not overwhelmed, and the students involved receive a fair, respectful, and timely outcome from the proceedings. We reiterate that instructional personnel has not only the right, but the duty to act, when suspecting academic misconduct, according to the regulations of Appendix 6

<p>6.4.2.I FACULTY ACTIONS (excerpt): If a faculty member, teaching assistant, or other instructional personnel suspects that an act of academic misconduct has occurred in a course, she or he must promptly communicate with the student regarding the alleged act of misconduct and the information upon which the allegation is based within 30 calendar 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 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.</p> <p>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</p>	<p>When an incident of alleged misconduct involves multiple (five or more) students the Instructor of Record can exercise the option to communicate with the students in writing. If appropriate, they can coordinate with SCAIP for support in the technical aspect for the delivery of such communication.</p>
--	--

<p>student in writing. Written communication will be sent to the student's University e-mail address. When multiple students are involved, faculty members are encouraged to communicate with each student separately.</p> <p>The Faculty member or the student may request the assistance of the Ombudsperson at the conference to assist in a fair and focused discussion about what may have occurred.</p> <p>The student must be given the opportunity to respond to the allegation of misconduct. When communication is made in writing, students will be given 14 calendar days to respond.</p>	
<p>6.4.3.II ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS (excerpt) The decision shall be forwarded in writing to the student within 20 calendar days of the review; and communicated to the instructor, school or college and/or division in accordance with legitimate educational interest criteria as articulated by the Family Education Rights and Privacy Act.</p>	<p>When an incident of alleged misconduct involves more than one student, the 20 calendar days limit should be interpreted as starting from the completion of the review of all students involved, as the decision may be affected by the outcome of the reviews of all students involved.</p>
<p>6.4.4.III ACADEMIC INTEGRITY COMMITTEES (excerpt): Within 20 calendar days, the Vice Provost for Administrative Resolution or his/her designee will send written notification to the student, the faculty member, and the dean or his/her designated associate dean for student academic affairs of the college/school detailing the decision and the sanctions imposed by the hearing panel.</p>	<p>When an incident of alleged misconduct involves more than one student, the 20 calendar days limit should be interpreted as starting from the date when all students involved have appeared in front of the Committee, as the decision may be affected by the outcome of the hearings of all students involved.</p>




ACADEMIC SENATE, 900 University Avenue, 231 University Office Building, Riverside, CA 92521

COMMITTEE ON RULES AND JURISDICTION

June 23, 2020

To: Dylan Rodríguez, Chair
Riverside Division

From: Nael Abu-Ghazaleh 
Chair, Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction

RE: Interpretation of Academic Integrity Appendices

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction reviewed the interpretation request from the Committee on Educational Policy (CEP) regarding academic integrity, specifically regarding sections 6.4.2.I; 6.4.3.II; and 6.4.4.III.

CEP's interpretation of 6.4.2.I is consistent with the regulation in that it is within the faculty member's scope to decide if an in-person meeting is not practical.

Sections 6.4.3.II and 6.4.4.III are more ambiguous but CEP's interpretation is consistent if the faculty member designates the set of cases as a single episode, so that the review is not concluded until the final case is resolved. What counts as a "review" is ambiguous in the Senate regulation and so CEP's interpretation is not inconsistent.

Lastly, CEP (via the Senate Chair or however deemed appropriate) is encouraged to reach out to the Chief Campus Counsel to get his advice on these interpretations from a legal (rather than from a Senate) perspective, including whether the pertinent Senate regulations themselves need to be clarified or if this written interpretation is sufficient. CEP can also seek clarification regarding FERPA as it relates to email communication in lieu of in-person meetings.