


TO: Ken Barish, Chair  
Riverside Division

FR: Kurt Schwabe, Chair   
Executive Committee, School of Public Policy

RE: **[Comments] POLICY AND PROCEDURES FOR RESPONDING TO  
ALLEGATIONS OF RESEARCH MISCONDUCT**

Date: November 30<sup>th</sup>, 2025

---

The Executive Committee of the School of Public Policy has reviewed the **Policy and Procedures for Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct**. Below we have identified a few issues to consider that may help address potential ambiguities/conflicts that may arise with how the policy is currently written.

- In Section II.12 (Plagiarism), plagiarism is defined as “the appropriation of another person’s ideas, processes, results, or words, without giving appropriate credit.” A number of widely-cited professional organizations (for example, the [American Psychological Association](#)) have issued guidelines regarding the need for disclosure of AI-generated materials. Since AI is not a person (to use the wording of the policy) but may be a source of material, it may be useful to clarify in this policy to what degree (if at all) the use of AI would constitute plagiarism.
- In Section VII.C.1 (Inquiry Committee). The policy currently states that “The Inquiry will be performed by one (1) to three (3) individual(s) appointed by the RIO.” By definition, a committee of only one person would not be a committee. In addition, the previous policy indicated that an inquiry committee “should consist of at least three individuals.” To avoid any one person having sole discretion as to an inquiry, clarification would be useful as to the justification for the reduction in number of committee members as well as how the number of people on the inquiry committee will be determined.
- In Section VIII.C.1 (Investigation Committee). Similar to the comment above, the policy currently states that “The Investigation Committee should consist of one (1) to three (3) individual(s).” By definition, a committee of only one person would not be a committee. In addition, the previous policy indicated that an investigation committee “should consist of at least three individuals.” To avoid any one person having sole discretion as to an inquiry, clarification would be useful as to the justification for the reduction in number of committee members as well as how the number of people on the inquiry committee will be determined.