



Academic Senate

COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGE & TENURE

December 1, 2025

To: Kenneth Barish, Chair
Riverside Division

Fr: Jennifer Doyle
Chair, Committee on Privilege & Tenure

Re: [Campus Review] Proposed Revised Policy: *Federally required changes to the Policy and Procedures for Responding To Allegations of Research Misconduct, Policy #529-900*

The Committee on Privilege and Tenure reviewed the proposed changes to the Policy and Procedures for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct, Policy #529-900. We have a few areas of concern. Below are requests for clarification and our recommendations.

Throughout the document, it is not clear if calendar or business days are being used. This should be made explicit.

Section A of Part III (Authority and Responsibility for Oversight and Implementation of the Policy and Procedure) describes the appointment of the Research Integrity Officer (the person responsible for the investigation of a case). The policy does not detail how an RIO is appointed in cases in which “the AVC of Research and a member of the Academic Senate” is not available (e.g. conflicted out of the case). We recommend that this process be made clear.

Section E of Part IV (General Principles): A six-year timeframe for the filing of research integrity complaints will require adjustments in the UC Records Retention Schedule, as a number of records related to research integrity are destroyed/deleted in less time.

Section B of Part VI (Preliminary Assessment): The timeframe for conducting a preliminary investigation has been deleted. We recommend a restoration of a version of the deleted text: “Research Integrity Officer shall conduct and complete the preliminary assessment promptly. If the Research Integrity Officer requires more than ten (10) days to complete the preliminary assessment, he or she shall document and record the reason and complete the assessment as promptly thereafter as possible.” An edited version of this text might specify ten business days.

Section B.1 of Part VI (Preliminary Assessment): We recommend the following edit for clarity: “The Investigation will begin within thirty (30) days ~~or within a reasonable time~~ after the

determination has been made that an Investigation is warranted. If an extension is needed, the reason and length of the extension should be documented by the RIO. If required by applicable law or regulation, the RIO will request an extension from the agency.”

Section E.3, of Part VII (Inquiry Into Allegations): Is there a justification for extending the time for the production of a draft Inquiry Report (from 60 to 90) and for compressing the time the respondent has to respond to the draft Inquiry Report from 14 days to 7? We are concerned about the imbalance between parties that are produced by these revisions to the time allotted to investigation and response.