




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.