NOTICE OF MEETING  
Tuesday, June 3, 2014, 3:30 p.m.  
Leichtag Building Conference Room

ORDER OF BUSINESS

(1) Minutes of Meeting of April 29, 2014  

(2-7) Announcements

(a) Chair Kit Pogliano  
Oral  

(b) Chancellor Pradeep Khosla  
Oral  

(c) Assistant Vice Chancellor Sylvia Lepe  
Oral

(8) Special Orders

(a) Senate Election Results [Gerry Boss, Vice Chair]  
Oral  

(b) IR/PS Name Change to School of Global Policy & Strategy  
[Barry Naughton, IR/PS Faculty]  
Oral

(9) Reports of Special Committees  [none]

(10) Reports of Standing Committees

(a) Committee on Senate Awards [Steven Schick, CSA Chair]  
2013-2014 Faculty Research Lecturer Awards  
Oral

(b) Graduate Council [Joel Norris, GC Chair]  
Specialization in Quantitative Biology (QBIO): New specialization in QBIO  
in six graduate degree programs: Department of Bioengineering, Division  
of Biological Sciences, Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry,  
Department of Physics, Bioinformatics and Systems Biology Graduate  
Program, and Biomedical Sciences Graduate Program  
Master of Public Policy, IR/PS  
Ph.D. in Education, Department of Education Studies  
MPIA Name Change (to MIA), IR/PS  

(c) Educational Policy Committee [Partho Ghosh, EPC Chair]  
Proposed Revision to Division Manual Appendix II – UCSD Policy on Integrity  
of Scholarship [rev.]  

(d) Committee on Privilege and Tenure [Stefan Tanaka, CPT Chair]  
Proposed Revision to Divisional Bylaw 230, Privilege and Tenure  

(11) Reports of Faculties

(a) Sixth College [Geoffrey Cook, Sixth College Faculty Executive Committee Member]
• Proposed Revision to Division Manual Appendix V, Bylaws of the Faculty of Sixth College

(12) Petitions of Students [none]

(13) Unfinished Business [none]

(14) New Business
**Representative Assembly 2013-2014 Membership**

**Ex Officio Members:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chair of Division</td>
<td>Kit Pogliano</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chancellor</td>
<td>Pradeep Khosla</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chair of Division</td>
<td>Gerry Boss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012-13 Chair of Division</td>
<td>T. Guy Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair, Committee on Academic Personnel</td>
<td>Stefan Llewellyn Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair, Committee on Admissions</td>
<td>Thaddeus Kousser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair, Committee on Diversity and Equity</td>
<td>Tara Javidi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair, Committee on Campus Community Environment</td>
<td>Shahrokh Yadegari</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair, Committee on Committees</td>
<td>Farrell Ackerman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair, Educational Policy Committee</td>
<td>Partho Ghosh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair, Undergraduate Council</td>
<td>James Nieh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair, Committee on Faculty Welfare</td>
<td>John Eggers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair, Graduate Council</td>
<td>Joel Norris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair, Committee on Planning and Budget</td>
<td>Samuel Buss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair, Committee on Privilege and Tenure</td>
<td>Stefan Tanaka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair, Committee on Research</td>
<td>Isaac Martin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chair, Univ. Committee on Affirmative Action &amp; Diversity</td>
<td>Emily Roxworthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Vice Chancellor, Academic Affairs</td>
<td>Suresh Subramani</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chancellor, Health Sciences</td>
<td>David A. Brenner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chancellor, Marine Sciences</td>
<td>Margaret Leinen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice Chancellor, Research</td>
<td>Sandra Brown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Elected Members**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Divisional Representative</th>
<th>Elected Members</th>
<th>Alternates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eduardo Macagno</td>
<td>('14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jan Talbot</td>
<td>('14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steven Wasserman</td>
<td>('15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Todd Kontje</td>
<td>('14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gershon Shafir</td>
<td>('14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brenda Bloodgood</td>
<td>('15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Adam Burgasser</td>
<td>('14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lakshmi Chilukuri</td>
<td>('15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scott Desposato</td>
<td>('14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arnold Rheingold</td>
<td>('14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Suzanne Brenner</td>
<td>('14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Joseph Pogliano</td>
<td>('14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Samuel Rickless</td>
<td>('14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Matthew Herbst</td>
<td>('14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Michael David</td>
<td>('15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Janis Jenkins</td>
<td>('15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>David Miller</td>
<td>('14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Richard Attiyeh</td>
<td>('14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steven Parish</td>
<td>('14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kun Zhang</td>
<td>('15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lin Chao</td>
<td>('15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gurol Suel</td>
<td>('15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Huilin Zhou</td>
<td>('15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles Perrin</td>
<td>('14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tadeusz Molinski</td>
<td>('15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patricia Jennings</td>
<td>('14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Pomeroy</td>
<td>('15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Angela Yu</td>
<td>('14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morana Alac</td>
<td>('14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles Elkan</td>
<td>('15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alex Oraiolglu</td>
<td>('15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Machina</td>
<td>('14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christopher Chambers</td>
<td>('15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kun Zhang</td>
<td>('15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lin Chao</td>
<td>('15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gurol Suel</td>
<td>('15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Huilin Zhou</td>
<td>('15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles Perrin</td>
<td>('14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tadeusz Molinski</td>
<td>('15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patricia Jennings</td>
<td>('14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Pomeroy</td>
<td>('15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Angela Yu</td>
<td>('14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morana Alac</td>
<td>('14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles Elkan</td>
<td>('15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alex Oraiolglu</td>
<td>('15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Machina</td>
<td>('14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christopher Chambers</td>
<td>('15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kun Zhang</td>
<td>('15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lin Chao</td>
<td>('15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gurol Suel</td>
<td>('15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Huilin Zhou</td>
<td>('15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles Perrin</td>
<td>('14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tadeusz Molinski</td>
<td>('15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patricia Jennings</td>
<td>('14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Pomeroy</td>
<td>('15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Angela Yu</td>
<td>('14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Morana Alac</td>
<td>('14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles Elkan</td>
<td>('15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alex Oraiolglu</td>
<td>('15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mark Machina</td>
<td>('14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Christopher Chambers</td>
<td>('15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kun Zhang</td>
<td>('15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lin Chao</td>
<td>('15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gurol Suel</td>
<td>('15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Huilin Zhou</td>
<td>('15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Charles Perrin</td>
<td>('14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tadeusz Molinski</td>
<td>('15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Patricia Jennings</td>
<td>('14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Robert Pomeroy</td>
<td>('15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>Advisor(s)</td>
<td>Year(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Tal Golan</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rachel Klein</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR&amp;PS</td>
<td>Barry Naughton</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gabriela Caballero</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>William O'Brien</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Camille Forbes</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>David Meyer</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jeffrey Rabin</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical &amp; Aerospace Engineering</td>
<td>George Tynan</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kal Seshadri</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine</td>
<td>Joachim Ix</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Connie Benson</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music</td>
<td>Katharina Rosenberger (Fall)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tamara Smyth (Wtr/Spr)</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NanoEngineering</td>
<td>Darren Lipomi</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurosciences</td>
<td>Robert Rissman</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thomas Hnasko</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ophthalmology</td>
<td>Linda Zangwill</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthopaedics</td>
<td>Sameer Shah</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pathology</td>
<td>David Pride</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>John Bradley</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lynne Bird</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacology</td>
<td>William Joiner</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philosophy</td>
<td>William Bechtel</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>Olga Dudko</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Benjamin Grinstein</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political Science</td>
<td>Samuel Kernell</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychiatry</td>
<td>Robert Clark</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Xianjin Zhou</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychology</td>
<td>Tim Rickard</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiation Medicine and Applied Sciences</td>
<td>Sunil Advani</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radiology</td>
<td>Yuval Rottenstrech</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reproductive Medicine</td>
<td>Alexander Kauffman</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIO</td>
<td>Eric Allen</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Steven Constable</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philip Hastings</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maria (Gabi) Laske</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Darcy Ogden</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lynne Talley</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology</td>
<td>Akos Rona-Tas</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSPPS</td>
<td>Philip Bourne</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural Engineering</td>
<td>Petr Krysl</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgery</td>
<td>Clark Chen</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brian Eliceiri</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre and Dance</td>
<td>Alan Burrett</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liam Clancy</td>
<td>(15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual Arts</td>
<td>Louis Hock</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kyong Park</td>
<td>(14)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Advisors:

- Research - General Campus: Amy Tsai (15) Alexei Kritsuk (15)
- Research - Health Sciences: David Boyle (15) Michael Baker (15)
- Research - Marine Sciences: Julie McClean (14) David Chadwell (14)
- Undergraduate Student: Robby Boparai (14)
- Undergraduate Student: Andrew Busselt (14)
- Graduate Student: Jordan Gosselin (14)
- Graduate Student: Rahul Kapadia (14)
Chair Pogliano called the meeting to order at 3:34 pm. A quorum was present (see attached attendance sheet), as were other Academic Senate members and guests. Chair Pogliano welcomed members and guests to the meeting and went over who can motion and vote. Chair Pogliano reviewed the Academic Senate Bylaws governing the privilege of the floor and voting. Chair Pogliano introduced guests and reviewed meeting agenda.

MINUTES OF MEETING OF JANUARY 28, 2014

The minutes of the meeting of January 28, 2014 were approved.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR OF THE DIVISION

Chair Pogliano began meeting with a change in the order of the agenda, beginning announcements from the Executive Vice Chancellor. There were no objections.

The Academic Senate is keeping a close watch on the new health care plans that were introduced this year; systemwide Faculty Welfare Committee is taking the lead on this. Major concern is with the availability of Tier 1 health care plans. It would be helpful if everyone would fill out the health care survey that is available on the Academic Senate webpage.

Systemwide Senate is conducting a total compensation review that will look at the total value of faculty compensation systemwide. The review will be available on the website once it has been released.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLOR

Executive Vice Chancellor Subramani is eagerly awaiting the state budget from Governor Brown. The Governor is looking to create a rainy-day fund from excess tax revenue. For the first time in several years, the California Legislature is backing the University of California in saying higher education needs to get a chunk of money; OP has recognized that President Napolitano has made great strides in getting the California Legislature on the same page as the University of California. A couple of examples are: President Napolitano has stated that she does not want to raise fees (CSU is raising fees, which the California Legislature is unhappy about) and that union contracts have been reached (with the exception of the Academic Student Employees) which the California Legislature is also happy about. OP is hoping for an 8 – 9 % increase in funds received from the state.

UCSD is moving forward as a campus with Strategic Planning. Hiring 80 new FTE’s over the next 3 years, which includes 20 joint appointments that are meant to encourage multi-disciplinary research. The intention is that these appointments will be truly joint (50/50), although this may not be feasible in all areas. Deans are being asked to forward a plan on how they would use the additional FTE’s and the process is well under way. All searches will be conducted by cross-campus hiring committees. The 80 new FTE’s do not include the 30 – 35 retirements the campus has been averaging each year. In sum total, will be recruiting 180 faculty over the next few years. The focus on campus will continue to be the academic vision.

ANNOUNCEMENTS BY STEVEN ADLER, COUNCIL OF PROVOSTS

Enclosed with the agenda is a newsletter/update that will be going out to the Senate and campus leaders periodically, to give an overview and update on what is going on in the colleges.

A new course titled “The First-Year Experience” will debut in Fall 2014 as a pilot for all incoming freshman. One hundred freshmen from each college (randomly selected) will be invited to participate in the pilot. The course was developed in collaboration with Provosts, Deans of Advising, Senate and campus leaders. The Undergraduate Council gave enthusiastic support to the two year pilot for this course. If the course is successful, the goal will be
to expand the course over time, and potentially make it a requirement for all incoming students. There is already
discussion to determine a mechanism for a pilot for transfer students for Fall 2015. Provosts will be listed as the
instructors of record for the course. This will be a two unit course, given a grade of P/NP. The course will have an
instructor, a graduate TA, and undergraduate discussion leaders. The course will focus on welcoming students to
the culture of a research university, how to choose a major (guidelines on how to think about a major and a road
map on selecting a major), research opportunities, value of study abroad, value of experiential learning, utilizing
resources, developing relationships with faculty/staff as mentors, creating communities, academic integrity,
acceptable student conduct, etc. There will be more to come on this course and the Council of Provosts will be
reaching out to many people in the room. If the course is successful, there will be a need for several more
instructors. The course is currently being funded by the Council of Provosts (and is very affordable at this point).

The campus Writing Center is completing year two of a three year trial. The effect campuswide is impressive;
great work is being done at the center. In the current year, the center has seen over 1,800 undergraduate students,
for over 4,000 one-on-one sessions. The Center helps students with writing application essays, cover letters,
resumes, etc. A large number of students who are using the center are from the History Department. Forty-seven
percent of students using The Center list a language other than English as their first language. The only staff at the
Writing Center is the director, Madeleine Picciotto.

Virtual Advising continues to be a success. Through the virtual advisor, students can submit questions, which
advisors are then able to answer. The most helpful part of the program is that several people (advisors, deans, etc.)
can view student questions, and it keeps a record of who has answered the student’s question.

Update from each college: TMC – co-sponsored an event to honor former Provost Faustina Solis and alumni James
Avery; additionally, the college commissioned an artistic mural and plaque for Solis Hall. Sixth College – is
improving online learning offerings, and a new version of CAT 125 is offered jointly with the writing faculty from
UCI, UCSB, and UCD. Muir – is partnering with EAOP, through CAMP program, to send undergraduate students
to local high schools to serve as college advisors to high school students. Warren – WAVE “adopted” Bayside
Elementary School, conducted two donation drives to assist families and students, co-wrote proposal that resulted
in school being chosen as MLK Day of Service site, and partnered with La Jolla Playhouse to sponsor the school’s
performances of their Pop! Tour. Roosevelt – offered its Break Away Global Services, a two-course sequence;
after the preparatory course, students travel with faculty and staff to a location for service work during spring break,
followed by optional research. Revelle – 50th anniversary Watermelon Drop is coming up.

**SPECIAL ORDERS**

Chair Pogliano announced that both nominees for Vice Chair (Chair Designate) of the Division were nominated by
Committees on Committees. All Divisional Representatives (two vacancies) to the systemwide Assembly of the
Academic Senate were also nominated by the Committees on Committees.

Senate Election – Nominations for Member of Committee on Committees – Chair Pogliano explained that one duty
of the Representative Assembly is to nominate two candidates for each vacancy on the Committee on Committees
to be filled by election. The Divisional Bylaws charge the Senate Council with providing a slate of nominations for
consideration by the Representative Assembly. Chair Pogliano explained that additional nominations may be made
from the floor by Representative Assembly members. However, before nominating a candidate, a faculty member
should determine that the person nominated is willing to run and serve the specified term. The ballot is to be
finalized today in order for elections to begin on May 6, 2014. There are three vacancies to be filled by the
election; each has a three year term.

Health Sciences – Chair Pogliano noted that the Assembly had the option of approving the slate as listed in the
agenda enclosure, which includes Wilbur Lew (Professor IR, Medicine) and Hoi (Ben) U (Professor, Surgery).
Both candidates were nominated by Senate Council. No additional nominations were made from the floor. A
motion was made and seconded to approve the nomination of Professor Lew and Professor U as candidates for the
Health Sciences vacancy on the Committee on Committees. The Assembly unanimously approved the nominations
by voice vote.
Scripps Institution of Oceanography – Chair Pogliano noted that the Assembly had the option of approving the slate as listed in the agenda enclosure, which includes Douglas Bartlett (Professor, Marine Biology Research Division) and Lynne Talley (Professor, Climate, Atmospheric Sciences & Physical Oceanography). Both candidates were nominated by Senate Council. No additional nominations were made from the floor. A motion was made and seconded to approve the nomination of Professor Bartlett and Professor Talley as candidates for the Scripps Institution of Oceanography vacancy on the Committee on Committees. The Assembly unanimously approved the nominations by voice vote.

Social Sciences – Chair Pogliano noted that the Assembly had the option of approving the slate as listed in the agenda enclosure, which includes Yen Espiritu (Professor, Ethnic Studies) and Ivan Evans (Professor, Sociology). Both candidates were nominated by Senate Council. No additional nominations were made from the floor. A motion was made and seconded to approve the nomination of Professor Espiritu and Professor Evans as candidates for the Social Sciences vacancy on the Committee on Committees. The Assembly unanimously approved the nominations by voice vote.

Chair Pogliano thanked everyone who agreed to run and wished them all good luck. She also reminded the Assembly that voting for the election will begin on May 6th and end on May 20th; a notice will be sent out. All voting is electronic and can be accessed from the Senate’s webpage. If there are any connectivity issues when voting, call Trevor at 858-534-7584 or come to the Senate Office (University Center 215) to vote.

REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES [none]

REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

Committee on Senate Awards – 2013-2014 Distinguished Teaching Award
Chair Pogliano asked Professor Judy Kim to present the Committee on Senate Awards’ recommendations for the recipients for the 2013-2014 Distinguished Teaching Awards. The nominations for Senate faculty are Brookie M. Best (Skaggs School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences), Stacey Brydges (Chemistry and Biochemistry), Sanjoy Dasgupta (Computer Sciences and Engineering), Nancy Kwak (History), and Natalia M. Molina (History). The nominees for the Saltman Distinguished Teaching Award for Non-Senate Members are Mirle D. Rabinowitz Bussell (Urban Studies and Planning), Nora D. Laiken (Medicine and Pharmacology), and Robert J. Ternansky (Chemistry and Biochemistry). The nominees for the Saltman Excellent Teaching Award for Graduate Students are Alexa Clemmons (Biological Sciences), David Stone (Physics), and Tara Zepel (Visual Arts).

On behalf of the Committee on Senate Awards, Professor Kim moved that the slate of nominees for the Distinguished Teaching Awards be approved as presented. [Because the motion was made on behalf of a committee, it required no second.] The motion was unanimously approved by a voice vote.

Chair Pogliano announced that Joel Dimsdale has been awarded the 2014 Oliver Johnson Award for lifetime Senate service. This award is voted on by the Academic Council and is only given out every two years. Professor Dimsdale will be recognized at the Distinguished Teaching and Senate Service Award ceremony on May 27, 2014.

Educational Policy Committee – Proposed Revision to Division Regulation 516 – Minimum Progress

Professor Partho Ghosh (Chair, Educational Policy Committee) presented the Assembly with proposed revisions. Proposed revisions to Division Regulation 516 – Minimum Progress would change minimum progress monitoring from quarterly to yearly. The amendment was brought to the EPC by a committee that was comprised of the Registrar and Council of Provosts. Minimum Progress is an important regulation that is often not enforced, and the change from quarterly to yearly monitoring would be much more manageable and will hopefully help in the enforcement of this regulation, which will also help with time to degree.

Comments/questions from faculty regarding proposed revisions:
- Do you anticipate that this change will force more students out of the university, as it seems that being flagged on a quarterly basis would be more helpful to students that are in “trouble” than being flagged on a yearly
basis? Response: Provost Adler stated that students that are in academic distress (subject to disqualification) are contacted on a quarterly basis, separate from being flagged for minimum progress.

- Why was the second “full-time” in the sentence crossed out? Response: Provost Adler stated that if a student goes all three quarters plus summer, the student can satisfy the minimum progress requirement without attending each quarter full-time.

- There was a motion from the floor to restore the second “full-time” in the first sentence. After further discussion, and no second to the motion, the motion was withdrawn.

On behalf of the Educational Policy Committee, Professor Ghosh moved that the revisions to Division Regulation 516 – Minimum Progress be approved as proposed. [Because the motion is made on behalf of a committee, no second is required.] The motion was approved by a majority voice vote, with 2 abstentions.

REPORTS OF FACULTIES [none]

Health Sciences Grant Research Committee: Division Bylaw 237 – Health Sciences Research Grant Committee Professor Tony Yaksh (Chair, Health Sciences Research Grant Committee) presented the Assembly with proposed revisions. Proposed revisions to Division Bylaw 237 – Health Sciences Research Grant Committee would increase the number of committee members from five to six. The number of grant application has been increasing considerably, and has required a considerable amount of time from each committee member. The addition of another committee member would help alleviate the burden of time commitment on committee members.

On behalf of the Health Sciences Research Grant Committee, Professor Yaksh moved that the revisions to Division Bylaw 237 – Health Sciences Research Grant Committee be approved as proposed. [Because the motion is made on behalf of a committee, no second is required.] Chair Pogliano called for further discussion of the motion. No comments were made. The motion was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Following the vote, EVC Subramani commented that the committee should consider only accepting applications from faculty members that are in compliance with state requirements. Professor Yaksh took note and will bring to the Chair that will be serving on the Health Sciences Research Grant Committee next year. Professor Yaksh also commented that this may go beyond the committee’s jurisdiction, and be a senate-wide issue.

PETITIONS OF STUDENTS [none]

UNFINISHED BUSINESS [none]

NEW BUSINESS [none]

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:31 p.m.

Ashley Welch
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REPORT OF THE GRADUATE COUNCIL

At its April 14, 2014 meeting, the Graduate Council approved a proposal to establish a new Ph.D. specialization in Quantitative Biology (QBIO) in the following six departments and graduate programs: Bioengineering, Biological Sciences, Bioinformatics & Systems Biology, Biomedical Sciences, Chemistry & Biochemistry, and Physics. The proposal requests the establishment of the following new Ph.D. degrees:

- Bioengineering with a Specialization in Quantitative Biology
- Bioinformatics and Systems Biology with a Specialization in Quantitative Biology
- Biology with a Specialization in Quantitative Biology
- Biomedical Sciences with a Specialization in Quantitative Biology
- Chemistry with a Specialization in Quantitative Biology
- Physics with a Specialization in Quantitative Biology

Students in this specialization must satisfy all degree requirements for a Ph.D. in their home department or graduate program and complete a curriculum that includes coursework in quantitative biology. The QBIO specialization is designed to equip students of strong quantitative background with knowledge and skills necessary to lead quantitative, multi-facet investigation of living systems.

The Council is supportive of this academic endeavor and recommends that the Representative Assembly approve the proposal.

Joel Norris, Chair
Graduate Council

The complete proposal is available for review at: http://senate.ucsd.edu/assembly/1314/PhDQBIO.pdf

Proposal to Establish a Ph.D. Specialization in Quantitative Biology (QBIO) in the Departments of Bioengineering, Biological Sciences, Chemistry & Biochemistry, and Physics; and the graduate programs in Bioinformatics & Systems Biology and Biomedical Sciences

Executive Summary
This proposal describes a new interdisciplinary Ph.D. specialization to be offered at UC San Diego in Quantitative Biology (QBIO). The proposed specialization will serve as the educational arm of UCSD’s Quantitative Biology Research Initiative that was launched a little more than two years ago.

This proposal spans three General Campus Divisions (Biological Sciences, Physical Sciences and the Jacobs School of Engineering) and the Health Sciences. Units participating in the specialization include the departments of Bioengineering, Biological Sciences, Chemistry & Biochemistry, and Physics; and the graduate programs in Bioinformatics & Systems Biology (BISB) and Biomedical Sciences (BMS). The resulting degree will be (name of Ph.D. program) with a “Specialization in Quantitative Biology.”

Quantitative Biology refers to the use of quantitative approaches, both experimental and theoretical, to discover the organizational principles of living systems. Its long-term goal is to establish a quantitative understanding of the physiological behaviors of biological organisms in terms of the molecular parts. In
the wake of rapid advances in biotechnology that enable researchers to collect large amounts of molecular data and perform high precision molecular manipulations, much is expected of the biological revolution of the 21st century, e.g., designed manipulation of micro-organisms in bioengineering, and rational intervention in personal medicine. A significant obstacle along the way is the lack of a predictive understanding connecting molecular interactions to physiology. Consequently, developing a comprehensive graduate program in Quantitative Biology is vital to training our graduate students to perform cutting edge research that is at the forefront of this rapidly advancing field.

The primary targets of the QBio Specialization will be those students with undergraduate training in the quantitative disciplines, but with the passion to study living systems. We expect the majority of the students to come from the departments in Physical Sciences and Engineering, but also hope to capture an increasing number of students with quantitative background seeking graduate studies in Biology and Biomedical Sciences.

This proposal blends existing and new lecture and lab courses, the latter of which will provide students with hands-on experience to design, build, and utilize instruments to address fundamental problems in living systems. The new theory courses will join those existing as general service courses that will benefit the entire UCSD campus as well as local industry in the San Diego area.

All necessary resources are in place to support this specialization. We propose to allow existing students to enroll in a majority of the lecture courses beginning Fall 2014 and to admit the first new class of students Fall 2015.
The Graduate Council approved a proposal for a new program of study leading to a Master of Public Policy (MPP) at the Graduate School of International Relations and Pacific Studies (IR/PS). The MPP is designed as a two-year full-time program. Students will complete a total of 92 units: 32 units of core coursework, 16 units in one of six Areas of Specialization, 40 units of electives, and a four-unit capstone course. The curriculum is designed to apply the hard skills in empirical analysis and quantitative evaluation toward the analysis of policy making in the United States and other major economies. It will prepare students with the skills needed to compare best practices in Asia, Latin America, and other parts of the developing world. The focus on national policy in a comparative sense draws upon existing strengths at IR/PS, and in the Departments of Political Science and Economics, and will give the School’s students an awareness of the larger global context in which national policy arises.

The MPP is a professional degree program and IR/PS has proposed a state-supported budget model that assesses Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST). The Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) reviewed the proposal and provided its comments to the Graduate Council. The Council determined that IR/PS is well positioned to offer the proposed MPP and the unique emphasis on public policy in a comparative context is likely to attract a strong applicant pool.

The Council is supportive of this academic endeavor and recommends that the Representative Assembly approve the proposal.

Joel Norris, Chair
Graduate Council

The complete proposal is available for review at: http://senate.ucsd.edu/assembly/1314/IRPSMPP.pdf

Proposal for a new Master of Public Policy at the Graduate School of International Relations and Pacific Studies

Executive Summary
The School of International Relations and Pacific Studies (IR/PS) is proposing the establishment of a Master of Public Policy program to be housed and administered at the School. IR/PS Faculty will collaborate with colleagues in the Departments of Political Science and Economics, and with occasional course offerings from across the campus, in order to provide a broad and current policy curriculum.

The Master of Public Policy will be a state funded professional degree requiring 92 units for graduation. Students will have eight introductory core courses (32 units) that cover hard skills in economics, the politics of policy-making and regulation, quantitative methods, and management, and, in the second year, a required capstone research seminar (4 units). Between years one and two, all students will be strongly encouraged to pursue an internship. IR/PS has a skilled Career Services team that already facilitates private and public local, national, and international placements for the MPIA.

Once through the core, students will have a remaining 56 units and will be required to complete at least one transcripted Area of Specialization of four courses (16 units). More than one will be allowed. Students choosing an international focus may elect to count twenty-four units of undergraduate language, taken at UCSD during the years of matriculation in the MPP program, toward the degree. Proven second year proficiency will be annotated to the transcript if the student so chooses.
The MPP curriculum can largely be taught with core IR/PS faculty and current adjuncts. However, MPP students would benefit from courses representing specialties in the Economics and Political Science Departments that are not central to the research and/or teaching priorities of IR/PS faculty. Examples of such courses might include state and federal politics and administrative rule making processes, migration policy, the economics of education, taxation, and labor economics. Faculty members in those departments have confirmed, by way of letters included in the proposal, that they would be very interested in teaching these courses. Department Chairs support the creation of an MPP at UCSD and have indicated a desire, also by letters included in the proposal, to cooperate with the program by working out arrangements for IR/PS to obtain desired courses on a predictable basis by either “swapping courses” with IR/PS (such as IR/PS faculty teaching PhD or undergraduate courses, as already occurs), teaching classes collaboratively involving students in both units, or having IR/PS fund the teaching of an alternative course by that Department. Based on conversations with the Departments, IR/PS is confident that appropriate specifics can be worked out for each desired course. As the MPP evolves, similar arrangements will be sought with STEM departments to further teaching collaborations like those already in place between IR/PS faculty and JSOE and SIO.
At its May 12, 2014 meeting, the Graduate Council approved a proposal for a new program of study leading to a Ph.D. degree in Education in the Department of Education Studies. The proposed degree program is designed for students with some practical experience in teaching and learning settings as well as in research. The program requires students to complete 36 units (nine courses) in foundational core courses designed to provide students with a common scholarly orientation, eight units (two courses) in research methods, 24 units of electives (six courses), a research apprenticeship course during each year of study, and a two-unit course on communicating research. Students may advance to candidacy in their third or fourth year of the Ph.D. program, at the conclusion of their coursework and after the successful defense of their dissertation proposal (qualifying examination). Students must complete a dissertation and the oral defense of the completed dissertation serves as the final exam. The normative time to degree is five years.

The Council is supportive of this academic endeavor and recommends that the Representative Assembly approve the proposal.

Joel Norris, Chair
Graduate Council

The complete proposal is available for review at:
http://senate.ucsd.edu/assembly/1314/PhDEducation.pdf

Proposal for a new Ph.D. in Education in the Department of Education Studies

Executive Summary
The UCSD Department of Education Studies proposes a Ph.D. in Education aimed at transforming education in diverse contexts. The Department has an interest in issues of equity in all aspects of the educational process, using a broad definition of underserved communities than is typically used in other programs/descriptions. The Department is interested in issues of equity related to students of color from linguistically and economically diverse communities, as well as other traditionally underserved communities such as those with physical/emotional/learning issues. As the Department is committed to transforming education in diverse settings, it also needs to take an inclusive approach to the definition of diversity.

The current education system does not work well for many students, particularly those from under-resourced and underserved communities, and the mission of the Department is to teach students to wield the tools of research to change disparities in educational experiences and student outcomes. This can be accomplished by creating a Ph.D. program that addresses existing challenges in racially, linguistically, and socially diverse educational environments and builds on the existing strengths as a department.

As part of the evolution of education research, the field of education will require Ph.D. graduates who are prepared to collaborate with policymakers, educators, families, and communities to transform current education policy and practice. The UCSD Department of Education Studies Ph.D. will provide a fresh approach to training such new researchers. Rather than train traditional faculty members to solely
generate knowledge documenting outcomes and processes in education, future faculty and researchers will be cultivated to serve and partner with communities through research in order to affect educational change in regional, national, and international settings.

To prepare this new generation of educational researchers, the Department will incorporate core elements of the existing Ed.D. in Teaching and Learning, most notably the close intersection between research and practice, into a distinctive new doctoral program. A signature pedagogy that reflects the Department’s commitment to quality teaching and transformative education will be sustained. With a focus on equity, equality, and justice, the program will train students to engage in research that can address problematic educational settings, practices, and policies. The program will explicitly articulate the links between university faculty, students, education practitioners, community members, policy-makers, and educational stakeholders. In addition to gaining a core foundational knowledge in theory, methods, and research in education, students in the Ph.D. program will have the opportunity to engage in interdisciplinary experiences working across UCSD divisions, departments, and research units.

Technology will be integrated throughout the program in course instruction, curriculum, research methods and professional networks, including both current technologies and new emerging ones. Throughout the program, technology will be introduced to support data collection and analysis. In data collection web delivery services will be used for questionnaires and surveys. Video conferencing tools will be used to facilitate interviews and focus groups, including multi-point video streaming. Web-based and local applications will be used for data analysis. Quantitative analysis will be supported with applications such as SPSS, PSPP, and other statistical software. Qualitative analysis of text, audio, and video data will be accomplished with software tools such as HyperResearch, Dedoose, InqScribe, and other qualitative analysis software tools as they emerge.

Students with a Ph.D. in Education from UCSD will have the following skills and knowledge:

- The ability to understand complex education problems specifically related to equity in educational experiences through interdisciplinary study and collaborative inquiry
- A strong knowledge of research methods that can be employed to interrogate, support, and enhance education policy and practice in education towards more equitable opportunities for systematically marginalized students
- A strong knowledge of theoretical frameworks investigating equity, diversity, and culture in the context of education.
- The knowledge to support equitable schooling for marginalized students and families and work proactively with schools, communities, and institutions
- The ability to effectively teach and mentor a diverse student body at the university level
- The ability to use technology as a tool for teaching, learning, research, collaborative scholarship, the dissemination of information, and coalition building among disparate communities. Students will learn to use Course Management Systems and other more cutting-edge teaching and learning network-support systems, such as Blink/Blackboard, Moodle, Edmodo, blogs, podcasts, Coursera, EdX, and newer systems as they emerge.

In sum, the objective of the Ph.D. in Education at UCSD is to prepare students to be impactful researchers who work with diverse populations, policy-makers, and stakeholders to transform and create more equitable educational opportunities for systemically marginalized students.
REPORT OF THE GRADUATE COUNCIL

At its April 14, 2014 meeting, the Graduate Council approved a proposal from the Graduate School of International Relations and Pacific Studies (IR/PS) to change the degree title for the Master of Pacific International Affairs (MPIA) to the Master of International Affairs (MIA). IR/PS is requesting to change the name of the MPIA degree because a review of peer schools shows that the closest name to a standard for the field of international affairs is the MIA. A survey of alumni also demonstrated that the current MPIA degree title invokes confusion with employers and the alumni’s strong preference is for IR/PS to use a degree title that is simpler and more universal.

The Council finds that changing the degree title represents a “simple name change” because it does not involve a fundamental modification of the program, a change in the degree requirements, or a need for substantial new resources. Currently, IR/PS offers both the MPIA and MIA degree titles with all students completing the same curriculum and degree requirements. The only difference between the MPIA and MIA is the structure of the degree programs (explained below). The Council determined that since MPIA and MIA students complete the same program of study and since the MIA degree title is an accepted standard in the field, the MIA degree title should be awarded to students in both the existing MIA degree program and the MPIA.

Currently, the MPIA is awarded to students who complete a graduate degree program that consists of 98 units of coursework and is typically completed in two years. The curriculum is made up of a set of eight core disciplinary and skill-oriented courses (32 units), a capstone (4 units), a two-course regional specialization (8 units), the foreign language requirements of second year proficiency (up to 24 units), a five-course professional career track (20 units), and unstructured electives. Students who have satisfied the language requirement prior to enrolling in the MPIA program take additional elective units.

The MIA is currently offered only to students who complete the five-year BA/MIA program at UCSD. After students’ successful completion of their fourth year of study at UCSD, they are awarded a B.A. in International Studies. As an undergraduate, students must complete the core and capstone courses for the undergraduate major in International Studies and 32 units of master’s-level courses offered at IR/PS. The 32 units of IR/PS coursework count toward fulfillment of the requirements for the bachelor’s degree and consist of the same core courses that graduate students in the two-year MPIA degree program complete during their first year of study. To receive the MIA degree after the student’s fifth year of study, students are required to satisfactorily complete 48 units of master’s-level coursework at IR/PS, including a regional specialization (8 units), a professional career track (20 units), a capstone requirement (4 units), and elective coursework (12 units). In order to receive the MIA degree, students must demonstrate second year proficiency in a foreign language. Students may complete this requirement by taking four quarters of undergraduate training in a Pacific Rim language during their undergraduate studies (also a requirement for the International Studies major) and two additional quarters as a graduate student if they have not satisfied the language requirement prior to enrollment.

The Council is supportive of this academic endeavor and recommends that the Representative Assembly endorse the proposal.

Joel Norris, Chair
Graduate Council

******************************************************************************************
Graduate School of International Relations and Pacific Studies’ Proposal to Change the Master of Pacific International Affairs (MPIA) to the Master of International Affairs (MIA)

As we change the name of the School, it is appropriate to simplify the name of our international affairs degree, the Master of Pacific International Affairs (MPIA). We propose to adopt the degree name Master of International Affairs (MIA) in place of the MPIA.

1. Our alumni agree:
   a. They consider the degree name to be a detriment to their career and report that they drop the ‘P’ on resumes.
   b. The name/acronym invokes confusion and questions from employers who do not know us well. It suggests narrowness.
   c. Their strong preference was that we find something simpler and more universal.

2. Our review of peer schools showed that the closest name to a standard for the field is a Master of International Affairs (MIA).

We recognize that we currently have a BA/MIA for UC San Diego undergraduates who are granted admission to IR/PS in their senior year. The key points are simple:

1. Those undergraduates take exactly the same curriculum as the MPIA students and do so in the same order, with the same standards of performance and the same time span.
2. They come in as a cohort with the first year MPIA admits and graduate with them two years later.
3. The BA/MIAs apply for the same jobs and internships with a claim to the same credentials.
4. The degree should be the same.
5. We should honor the wishes of our students, past and present, to relieve them of a degree title that does not help them the way it should.
REPORT OF THE EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE

The Educational Policy Committee (EPC) proposes several amendments to Appendix II – UCSD Policy on Integrity of Scholarship. The Representative Assembly reviewed an earlier version of the proposed revisions at the January 28, 2014 meeting. The Assembly returned the Policy to EPC for further consideration, due to concerns over a proposed change in wording to Section VI, Bullet 2. EPC discussed this section at length, and the Committee concluded that the changes to the wording, as originally proposed by EPC, should stand. EPC’s justification for not further altering the text is included below.

Since the Policy was returned to EPC, the Committee took the opportunity to also make additional changes to the text. The revised Policy (attached) shows the affected portions of the Policy, with proposed additions underlined and proposed deletions shown with strike outs. New edits are in red and the original edits reviewed on January 28 are in blue. A brief summary of all the proposed revisions to the Policy is below.

General
- References to the Academic Integrity Coordinator have been replaced with the Academic Integrity Office (AI Office).
- References to the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs have been amended to reflect that position’s new title of Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.
- References to notifications are uniformly listed as notifications “in writing”. This replaces references to notifications sent “via e-mail” or “via hard copy”.
- References to grading have been updated to eGrades from course grade sheets, which are no longer in use. (NEW)

Introduction
- The Introduction has been amended to clarify that the Policy applies to non-matriculated students enrolled in UCSD courses and students enrolled at UCSD. (NEW)

Section II
- Bullet 1 – Revised to speak to cases where a student provides unauthorized material containing questions/answers to an examination during the examination based on a recommendation from a member of the Academic Integrity Review Board (AIRB). (NEW)

Section IV
- Section IV has been amended to more clearly identify the source of authority for instructors and the administration relevant to resolution of charges of academic dishonesty.
- Section IV.B – Added a link to the sanctioning guidelines.
- Section IV.B – Added the appropriate administrative authorities for non-matriculated students enrolled in a UCSD course through Summer Session and University Extension. References to administrative authorities and administrative sanctions were updated throughout the Policy accordingly. (NEW)
- Section IV.C – Revised to state that all involved parties will normally be notified of extensions to the policy’s procedural deadlines.
Section V

- Section V.A, paragraph 4 – Amended to direct instructors to submit their charge as soon as possible or within fifteen days of the due date for grades.
- Section V.A, paragraph 5 – Amended to clarify that academic grades may be determined solely on academic work.
- Section V.A, paragraph 6 – Added a new paragraph to state that, “An instructor may not withdraw a charge if a student has accepted responsibility of violating the Policy or has been found responsible for violating the Policy.”
- Section V.B.3, paragraph 1 – Amended to clarify that the student must explain why he or she contests the charges when he or she requests an Academic Integrity Review of the charge.
- Section V.B.5, paragraph 2 – Added the Assistant Dean of Graduate Studies as eligible to serve as the Presiding Officer based on a recommendation from the Academic Integrity Office. (NEW)
- Section V.C.1 – Changed the submission process to direct appeals to the AI Office. The AI will forward the appeals to the appropriate administrative authority.
- Section V.C.1, paragraph 3 – Added a new paragraph to designate the appropriate authorities to which non-matriculated students enrolled in a UCSD course through Summer Session or UCSD Extension may appeal the determination of the Academic Integrity Review Panel or Administrative Sanction. (NEW)

Section VI

- Bullet 2 – Amended to clarify that Academic Records will only administratively re-enroll a student in a course if the student drops the course after a charge has been filed with the AI Office. This paragraph also was amended to allow instructors to submit charges for all coursework submitted by students, including those students that have since dropped themselves from the course. In these cases, academic sanctions will not be applied, but the revision would permit the University to apply administrative sanctions in cases where a student is found responsible for violating the Policy.

Rationale for proposed change:
Section V.A of the Policy allows Instructors with reason to believe that a Student has violated the Policy to proceed in one of two ways—meet with the Student to discuss the suspected violation or submit a formal charge to the AI Office. The Committee finds that Section VI, Bullet 2 is intended to clarify that Students may not drop a course after a charge is filed with the AI Office. The current phrasing in this section, “While a hold is in effect, the Student shall not drop the course” is vague and does not clearly articulate that the hold begins when a formal charge is filed.

The Committee finds that to ensure fair treatment of all Students, it is important that the deadline for a Student to drop the course is linked to a documented event managed by the AI Office. If the Instructor has reason to believe that the Policy has been violated, s/he may move forward with submitting a formal charge. It is up to the Instructor to decide whether to meet with the Student before submitting a formal charge, and by doing so, there is a chance that the student may drop the course in the interim. If the deadline for dropping the course were changed to link it to Instructors’ suspicion that an academic integrity violation occurred, this may lead to subjective interpretations of when the Student was no longer allowed to drop the course depending on the circumstances of each individual case. This may compromise the University’s ability to treat all students equally under the Policy.
• Bullet 4 – Amended to clarify that Academic Records does not drop students from duplicate, crosslisted, or equivalent courses, but rather ensures that, if a student is found responsible for violating the Policy, the grade given in the course with the Academic Dishonesty charge is not removed from the GPA. (NEW)

Section VII (new section)
• Added new section to cover academic dishonesty in independent exams (exams outside of coursework; for example, qualifying exams). The proposed text outlines appropriate academic sanctions for cases of dishonesty in independent exams, and stipulates that only the timelines included under the section on appeals of academic sanctions apply in these cases.

The Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction has reviewed the revised Policy and found it consonant with the Code of the Academic Senate.

The Educational Policy Committee recommends that the Representative Assembly approve the amended version of the UCSD Policy on Integrity of Scholarship and that it take effect on the first day of instruction of Fall Quarter, 2014.

Partho Ghosh, Chair
Educational Policy Committee
Integrity of scholarship is essential for an academic community. The University expects that both faculty and students will honor this principle and in so doing protect the validity of University intellectual work. For students, this means that all academic work will be done by the individual to whom it is assigned, without unauthorized aid of any kind. Instructors, for their part, will exercise care in planning and supervising academic work, so that honest effort will be upheld.

The UCSD Policy on Integrity of Scholarship (herein the “Policy”) states the general rules and procedures associated with student integrity of scholarship. This Policy applies to undergraduate and graduate students enrolled in at UCSD and/or enrolled in a UCSD course. A separate policy exists governing integrity of research. Medical students are governed by policies specified in the Handbook for School of Medicine Advisors and Students, as formulated by the School of Medicine Committee on Educational Policy. Pharmacy students are governed by the Skaggs School of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences (SSPPS) Policy on Integrity of Scholarship as formulated by the SSPPS faculty. In this Policy, the term “in writing” is defined as communications delivered either on paper or electronically via email.

I. Instructors’ Responsibility

The Instructor shall state in writing how graded assignments and exams will contribute to the final grade in the course. If there are any course-specific rules required by the Instructor for maintaining academic integrity, the instructor shall also inform students of these in writing.

II. Students' Responsibility

Students are expected to complete the course in compliance with the instructor's standards. No student shall engage in an activity that involves attempting to receive a grade by means other than honest effort; for example:

- No student shall knowingly procure, provide, or accept any unauthorized material that contains questions or answers to any examination or assignment to be given at a subsequent time that is being, or will be, administered.

- No student shall complete, in part or in total, any examination or assignment for another person.

- No student shall knowingly allow any examination or assignment to be completed, in part or in whole, for himself or herself by another person.

- No student shall plagiarize or copy the work of another person and submit it as his or her own work.

- No student shall employ aids excluded by the instructor in undertaking course work or in completing any exam or assignment.

- No student shall alter graded class assignments or examinations and then resubmit them for regrading.

- No student shall submit substantially the same material in more than one course without prior authorization.

III. The Instructional Assistant’s (IA) Responsibilities
A student acting in the capacity of an Instructional Assistant (IA), a category including but not limited to teaching assistants, readers, and tutors, has a special responsibility to safeguard integrity of scholarship. In this role the student functions as an apprentice instructor, under the tutelage of the responsible instructor. An IA shall equitably grade student work in the manner agreed upon with the course instructor. An IA shall not provide a student with any information or collaboration that would aid the student in completing the course in a dishonest manner (e.g., providing access to unauthorized material related to tests, exams, and homework).

IV. Responsibility for Resolution of Cases of Violation of the Policy

The responsibility for maintaining the standards of academic honesty rests with two University authorities: the faculty and the administration. Under the Standing Orders of the Regents, authority over courses and curricula is delegated to the faculty through the Academic Senate. The University of California’s Policy on Student Conduct and Discipline authorizes UCSD administration to discipline students for academic misconduct, is the exclusive responsibility of the campus administration, while authority over courses and curricula is delegated to the faculty through the Academic Senate. All cases in which the Student is found responsible for violating the Policy will result in both an academic and an administrative sanction.

A. Academic Responsibilities and Sanctions

The Instructor shall report the alleged violation to the Academic Integrity Coordinator Office, shall participate in the process according to the Policy, and when the case is resolved, shall determine the Student’s grade in the course. Any violation of the Policy by the Student may be considered grounds for failure in the course, although less serious consequences may be incurred in less serious circumstances. An Instructor shall not assign an academic sanction for academic dishonesty unless he or she has submitted a report of an alleged violation of the Policy and the Student has either admitted responsibility for, or has been found responsible for, violating the Policy.

B. Administrative Authority and Sanction

The appropriate administrative authority shall impose an administrative sanction in accordance with guidelines authorized by the Educational Policy Committee. For undergraduates, the appropriate administrative authority is the Council of Deans of Student Affairs. For graduate students, the appropriate administrative authority is the Assistant Dean of Graduate Studies. For non-matriculated students enrolled in a UCSD course through Summer Session, the appropriate administrative authority is the Director of Summer Session. For non-matriculated students enrolled in a UCSD course through University Extension, the appropriate administrative authority is the Student Affairs Manager. Administrative sanctions range in severity from administrative probation to dismissal from the University. Students found responsible for multiple cases of academic dishonesty shall be subject to dismissal from the University. Sanctioning guidelines can be found at http://academicintegrity.ucsd.edu.

C. The Academic Integrity Coordinator Office (AI Office)

The Academic Integrity Coordinator Office (AI Office) is the initial contact for the Instructor and the administrative manager for the processing of cases of Policy violations. The AI Office may extend any timelines in the Policy when practical exigencies so dictate, in which case all involved parties will normally be notified in writing and via email. The AI Office shall maintain a record of all cases and shall report annually to the Academic Senate Educational Policy Committee, to the Council of Provosts, and to the Senior Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs on the number, nature, and type of cases; the pattern of decision-making; the severity and type of academic and administrative sanctions; and other relevant matters as directed by the Educational Policy Committee.

V. Procedures for Resolution of Cases of Violations of the Policy

The procedure for resolution of cases of violating the Policy is divided into three phases: A, Reporting Phase; B, Decision and Resolution Phase; C, Appeals Phase.
A. The Reporting Phase

When an Instructor has reason to believe that a Student has violated the Policy, the Instructor should proceed in one of two ways:

(I) Meet with the Student to discuss the suspected violation. If the Instructor decides that there is evidence of a Policy violation, he or she must submit a formal charge describing the suspected violation to the Office of the Academic Integrity Coordinator (AIC)AI Office.

(II) Submit a formal charge to the AIC AI Office describing the alleged violation.

All alleged cases of academic dishonesty must be reported. To file a charge of violating the Policy with the AICAI Office, an Instructor must submit in writing or via email the following information: the Student’s name, the Student’s PID, the course name and number, the date of the alleged incident, and a description of the incident. Upon receiving the charge, the AIC AI Office will initiate the resolution process, as described in Section B below.

If the Instructor has submitted a formal charge of violating the Policy, he or she will refrain from assigning a course grade for the Student until the charge has been resolved. If the course concludes before the charge is resolved, the Instructor will assign an “X” code on the course grade sheet for the Student’s grade in eGrades, which indicates that the X is due to a “Pending Charge of Academic Dishonesty” and will indicate in the memorandum column that this X is for a “Pending Charge of Academic Dishonesty”.

If there is insufficient time to submit a charge of violating the Policy before grades are due (e.g., suspected violation occurred during the final exam), then the Instructor may assign an X code for the course before a charge is filed with the AIC Office. In this case, the Instructor must:

i) assign an X code on the course grade sheet for the Student’s grade in eGrades, which indicates that the X is due to a “Pending Charge of Academic Dishonesty” and will indicate in the memorandum column that this X is for a “Pending Charge of Academic Dishonesty”. eGrades will automatically notify the AI Office that a formal charge is forthcoming, and

ii) notify the AIC AI Office within 48 hours of submitting the grade sheet of the Student’s name, that an Integrity X code has been assigned, and that a formal charge is forthcoming, and

iii) file a formal charge to the AIC AI Office as soon as possible, normally within fifteen (15) business days of assigning the X code the grades due date.

If, after reporting a charge to the AICAI Office, the Instructor decides to withdraw the charge, the Instructor shall notify the AIC AI Office via email or in writing of his or her decision. The Instructor shall determine the grade for the course based on the student’s academic work. If an X has been assigned, the Instructor shall assign a grade for the course by submitting to Academic Records an official Change of Grade form with the note “Faculty Hold Resolved”. The AIC AI Office shall notify the Student, the appropriate Dean/administrative authority, the department chair/program director, and Academic Records that the charge against the Student has been withdrawn by the Instructor. All notations of the charge shall be removed from the Student’s academic record. If an X has been assigned, the Instructor shall assign a grade for the course in eGrades once Academic Records has removed all notations of the charge. The charge may be reinstated in accordance with this Policy should new evidence become available.

An instructor may not withdraw a charge if a student has accepted responsibility of violating the Policy or has been found responsible for violating the Policy.

B. The Decision and Resolution Phase

Once the Instructor has reported a charge of violating the Policy to the AICAI Office, the AIC AI Office shall
immediately notify the appropriate **Dean administrative authority** in writing and via email, with a copy to the Instructor and to Academic Records that the Student is charged with violating the Policy. Within two (2) business days, the administrative authority Dean shall notify the Student in writing and via email of the charge and copy the AIC AI Office and the Instructor. The official notice shall be sent to the Student’s UCSD email address, and a written notice shall also be sent to the Student’s current address of record on file with the UCSD Registrar’s Office. It shall be assumed that the notice of the charge was received by the Student when it is sent in this manner.

If Students from two or more undergraduate colleges are allegedly involved in the same incident, the AIC AI Office will direct the case to the chair of the Council of Deans of Student Affairs. The chair will then appoint one of the Deans to proceed with the case for all Students, regardless of undergraduate college. If the charge involves both undergraduate and graduate Students, the chair of the Council of Deans of Student Affairs and the Assistant Dean of Graduate Studies shall consult and agree on how to proceed with the case. **If the charges involve non-matriculated students enrolled through Summer Session or Extension, please refer to Section IV.B. on the appropriate administrative authority to be consulted.**

1. **The Student’s deadline for responding to charge(s) of violating the Policy**

   Within ten (10) business days of the date of notification by the **Dean appropriate administrative authority**, the Student must respond to the **Dean administrative authority** acknowledging receipt of the charge and arranging to meet (either in person or via telephone) with the **Dean administrative authority** to discuss the charge(s) and possible administrative sanctions. The **Dean administrative authority** shall review the charge(s) with the Student and may advise and assist the Student regarding possible administrative sanctions and the process for resolution of the charge(s) of violating the Policy. Within twelve (12) business days of the date of notification by the **Dean administrative authority**, the Student must report to the **Dean administrative authority** his or her decision either to accept the charge of violating the Policy or to contest the charge and request an Academic Integrity Review.

2. **Decision I: Student accepts charge(s) of violating the Policy**
   a. **Administrative Sanction**

      Administrative sanctions range from administrative probation to dismissal from the University, depending on the severity of the case, any previously recorded offenses, and any mitigating circumstances.

      For undergraduate students, the appropriate Dean shall make a recommendation of the administrative sanction(s) to the Council of Deans of Student Affairs. The Council of Deans of Student Affairs shall determine the administrative sanction(s) and shall notify the AIC AI Office of the decision within thirty (30) calendar days from the date of the AIC AI Office’s notification of the charge.

      For graduate students, the Assistant Dean of Graduate Studies shall determine the administrative sanction(s) and shall notify the AIC AI Office of the administrative decision within thirty (30) calendar days from the date of the AIC AI Office’s notification of the charge.

      For non-matriculated student enrolled in a UCSD course through Summer Session or UCSD Extension, the appropriate administrative authority identified in Section IV.B. shall determine the administrative sanction(s) and shall notify the AI Office of the administrative decision within thirty (30) calendar days from the date of the AI Office’s notification of the charge.

      A record of the administrative sanction(s) shall be maintained by the AIC AI Office, the appropriate **Dean administrative authority**, the Council of Deans of Student Affairs (for undergraduates), and Academic Records.

   b. **Academic Sanction**
Within ten (10) business days of being notified of the administrative sanction(s), the AIC-Al Office shall notify the Instructor, the department chair/program director, and Academic Records of the administrative sanction(s). Academic Records shall update or remove all notations of the charge from the Student’s academic record and shall direct the Instructor to assign a grade for the course in eGrades, and submit the Change of Grade form if an X has been assigned.

The Instructor shall determine the grade for the course. If an X has been assigned, the Instructor shall assign a grade for the course by submitting to Academic Records an official Change of Grade form with the note “Faculty Hold Resolved” submitting the grade in eGrades. If the outcome is not determined within the calendar year, Academic Records shall direct the Instructor to submit a clerical error form to assign a grade and Academic Records will post the assigned grade. Upon notification from Academic Records that the final grade has been recorded, the AIC-Al Office will notify the Student, the Instructor, the Dean, appropriate administrative authority, and the department chair/program director of the resolution of the case with a report of both the administrative and academic sanctions.

3. Decision II: The Student contests the charge of violating the Policy and requests an Academic Integrity Review

If the Student contests the charge of violating the Policy (Decision II), he or she must submit to the appropriate Dean, administrative authority a written request for an Academic Integrity Review with an explanation of why the charge is contested to the appropriate Dean.

a. This request must be received by the appropriate Dean, administrative authority within twelve (12) business days of the date of the notification of the charge.

b. Within two (2) business days of receiving the Student’s written request for an Academic Integrity Review, the Dean, administrative authority shall transmit the written request to the AIC-Al Office along with any additional relevant documentation.

c. Within two (2) business days of receiving the Dean’s administrative authority’s request, the AIC-Al Office shall notify the Student, the Instructor, and the Dean, administrative authority via email in writing that the request for an Academic Integrity Review was received.

4. The Academic Integrity Review (AIR)

The purpose of an Academic Integrity Review is to explore and investigate the incident giving rise to the charge and to reach an informed, evidence-based conclusion as to whether the Policy was violated.

5. Composition of the Academic Integrity Review Board and the Review Panel

The composition of the Academic Integrity Review Board (AIRB) shall be as follows:

a. Twenty-five (25) faculty members appointed by the Academic Senate Committee on Committees.

b. At least six (6) graduate students appointed by the Graduate Student Association in collaboration with the Assistant Dean of Graduate Studies.

c. At least twelve (12) upper division undergraduate students, two from each college, appointed by the college Dean.

For each AIR request, the AIC-Al Office shall select from the AIRB five (5) members (the “Review Panel”), which shall normally be composed of three faculty members, one graduate student, and one undergraduate student. The AIC-Al Office shall also select a college Dean or the Assistant Dean of Graduate Studies, who is not the Dean or Assistant Dean of the Student, to serve as the Presiding Officer. The Presiding Officer shall conduct the review and advise the Review Panel on procedure, but shall not vote. In the event that a five-member Review Panel is not available (e.g., during the summer months or due to unforeseen circumstances, a recusal or challenge of a Review Panel member, or last minute absences), the Student shall be given the option of electing to proceed with a reduced Review Panel. If the Student elects to proceed with a reduced Review Panel, the composition of the Review Panel shall be as follows:
Panel, the Presiding Officer, or the Academic Integrity Office (AIC AI Office) when appropriate, may agree to proceed with not less than two (2) faculty members and one (1) student (either undergraduate or graduate).

A Review Panel member may recuse himself or herself or the Student may challenge the participation of a Review Panel member only when a reasonable person would recognize a conflict of interest or an inability of the Review Panel member to be unbiased; for example, when there is a personal or authoritative relationship between the Student and a Review Panel member. The Presiding Officer shall make the final determination on challenges to Review Panel composition. In the event that the AIR cannot proceed due to Review Panel composition, the Presiding Officer shall call for a continuance until such time as an appropriate Review Panel can be constituted.

6. Notice of the Academic Integrity Review

As soon as possible, and normally no longer than one quarter after receipt of the request for an AIR, the AIC AI Office shall schedule a review of the case by a Review Panel. The AIC AI Office shall normally provide at least ten (10) business days’ notice in writing to the Student and the Instructor of the time, date, and location of the AIR, although exceptions can be made if both the Student and the Instructor agree. The official notice shall be sent to the Student’s UCSD email address, and a written notice shall also be sent to the Student’s current address of record on file with the UCSD Registrar’s Office. It shall be assumed that the notice of review was received by the Student when it is sent in this manner.

The notice shall include a statement that the UCSD Policy on Integrity of Scholarship is alleged to have been violated and a statement that an AIR has been scheduled. If the time and place of the AIR are not known, the notice shall include a statement indicating that a subsequent notice will be sent specifying same. In the event that the time or place is adjusted after the original notice is sent, an email notifying the parties to this effect shall be deemed sufficient notice.

Objections to the time and date of the AIR will be ruled on by the Presiding Officer no later than five (5) business days before the AIR. Academic Integrity Reviews shall not normally be rescheduled to accommodate the Student’s work, class, or personal conflicts unless undue hardship would otherwise be experienced by the Student. Academic Integrity Reviews shall not normally be rescheduled to accommodate the availability of Relevant Parties.

7. The Review Packet

Once an AIR has been requested by the Student, the relevant documents will be collected, including the facts of the charge by the Instructor and the Student’s dispute of the facts of the charge. The Student or the Instructor may also submit to the AIC AI Office additional documents relevant to the charge, or the names and contact information of any additional people (e.g., classmates, teaching assistants) who have knowledge relevant to the charge (Relevant Parties). All documents must be submitted to the AIC AI Office within ten (10) business days of the receipt of the review request by the AIC AI Office.

The AIC AI Office will make available to the Presiding Officer, the Instructor, and the Student a copy of the documents relevant to the charge (the Review Packet) no later than five (5) business days before the date of the AIR.

Newly available documents not included in the Review Packet can be presented at the AIR subject to the approval of the Presiding Officer. In such circumstances, the Presiding Officer should provide the Review Panel, the Student, and the Instructor with adequate time to review the new information.

8. Parties Attending the AIR

A Relevant Party is one with direct and material understanding of the case.
Normally, the Instructor bringing the charge forward and the Student requesting the AIR must be present for the AIR. However, in lieu of attending the AIR, the Instructor and/or the Student may forfeit in-person participation and provide a written statement.

The Student’s absence from or silence during the AIR shall not imply acceptance of responsibility. The University will normally conduct a single AIR to address the charges made against multiple Students in the same incident unless the Students would experience substantial prejudice as a result of a joint AIR. The Dean—appropriate administrative authority with whom the Students meet to request an AIR will, in consultation with the AICAI Office, hear and decide on prejudice concerns.

Recognizing their formal role in the University instruction, in cases where an Instructional Assistant (IA) is involved, the IA may also be present for the entire AIR rather than partially as a Relevant Party.

The Student may be accompanied by an Associated Students Student Advocate in the AIR. The Student should present his or her own case, but the Advocate may assist the Student with questioning and procedural issues. The Advocate may not normally appear at the AIR in lieu of the Student, but in the event that the Advocate is present but the Student is not, the AIR may continue at the discretion of the Presiding Officer, questions may be asked of the Advocate, and the Advocate may address procedural issues on behalf of the Student. Prior to the AIR, the AICAI Office shall be available to advise the Instructor of the procedures and options for presentation of the case, but the Instructor may be accompanied in the AIR only by a faculty colleague acting under the same restrictions as a Student Advocate.

The Instructor and the Student shall have the right to present Relevant Parties and question all Relevant Parties present at the AIR. In lieu of Relevant Parties attending the AIR, the Instructor and/or the Student may submit written statements from Relevant Parties as part of the Review Packet. Normally, Relevant Parties are present at the AIR only for the time they are presenting their statements and being questioned by the Instructor, the Student, and the Review Panel.

9. The Academic Review Process

The Review Panel shall hold an AIR and decide based on the preponderance of evidence presented at the AIR whether or not the Student is responsible for violating the Policy. Academic Integrity Reviews are fundamentally educative and investigative in nature, and thus the rules of evidence used in legal proceedings do not apply.

The Presiding Officer shall conduct the AIR in such a manner as to ensure fairness to the Student and to the Instructor, to maintain order and decorum, to facilitate presentation of evidence, and to provide an opportunity for questions to be asked by the Review Panel.

No AIR shall be undertaken without a reliable recording. The Presiding Officer shall provide for either a reliable audio recording of the AIR or keep written minutes summarizing the AIR. Any recording shall be retained as part of the permanent record by the Student’s Dean—administrative authority. Transcripts of the AIR will not be made by the University, but if either the Instructor or the Student makes a transcript at his or her own expense, copies should be provided to the other party for the cost of the copy or ten cents per page, whichever is less. Procedures for such record keeping are covered by the UCSD Student Records Policy as implemented by PPM 160-2.

No other recording or broadcasting devices shall be allowed in the AIR.

The final determination of the case shall rest with the Review Panel. The Instructor and the Student, along with any other parties to the AIR, will be excused before the Review Panel begins its deliberations. Review Panel deliberations shall always be confidential and conducted in private with only the Review Panel members and the Presiding Officer present. The responsibility of the Review Panel is only to determine whether the Student
violated the Policy, although the Review Panel can make recommendations regarding administrative sanctions to be considered by the Council of Deans or appropriate administrative authority. In AIRs where there is more than one Student charged, the Review Panel must make a separate determination for each Student.

Within five (5) business days from the date on which the AIR is completed, the Presiding Officer shall forward via email the Review Panel’s determination to the appropriate Dean or administrative authority, with copies to the AIC AI Office, the department chair/program director, the Instructor, and the Student.

10. Determination of Sanctions

If the student is found responsible for violating the Policy, sanctions shall be determined as follows:

a. Administrative Sanction

If an undergraduate Student is found responsible for violating the Policy, the appropriate Dean shall make a recommendation of the administrative sanction(s) to the Council of Deans of Student Affairs. The Council of Deans of Student Affairs shall determine the administrative sanction(s) and shall inform the Student and the AIC AI Office in writing within ten (10) business days after the receipt of the notice of the Review Panel’s determination.

If a graduate Student or non-matriculated Student enrolled in a UCSD course through Summer Session or University Extension is found responsible for violating the Policy, the appropriate administrative authority identified in Section IV.B. shall determine the administrative sanction(s) and shall inform the Student and the AI Office in writing within ten (10) business days after the receipt of the notice of the Review Panel’s determination.

A record of the administrative sanction(s) shall be maintained by the AIC, the appropriate Dean or administrative authority, the Council of Deans of Student Affairs (for undergraduates), and Academic Records.

b. Academic Sanction

The AIC AI Office shall notify the Instructor, the department chair/program director, and Academic Records of the administrative sanction(s) and shall direct the Instructor to assign a grade for the course and submit the Change of Grade form in eGrades if an X has been assigned.

Within ten (10) business days after receiving the official notice from the AIC AI Office, the Instructor shall determine the grade for the course. Academic Records shall update or remove all notations of the charge from the Student’s academic record and direct the Instructor to assign a grade for the course in eGrades. If the outcome is not determined within the calendar year, Academic Records shall direct the Instructor to submit a clerical error form to assign a grade and Academic Records will post the assigned grade. If an X has been assigned, the Instructor shall assign a grade for the course by submitting to Academic Records an official Change of Grade form with the note “Faculty Hold Resolved”. Upon notification from Academic Records that the final grade has been recorded, the AIC AI Office will notify the Student, the Instructor, the Dean or appropriate administrative authority, and the department chair/program director of the resolution of the case with a report of both the administrative and academic sanctions and that the case is closed.

If the Review Panel finds the evidence insufficient to sustain the charge of violating the Policy, the administrative authority and the Instructor shall dismiss the matter without further action against the Student, who shall be permitted either to complete the course without prejudice or to withdraw from it. The AIC AI Office shall notify the Student of his or her options and, within five (5) business days of the date of the letter, the Student shall notify the AIC AI Office of his or her decision. If the Student does not notify the AIC AI Office within this timeframe, it shall be assumed that the Student is electing to complete the course without prejudice. The AIC AI Office shall then notify the Instructor and Academic Records of the Student’s
decision. If the Student withdraws from the course, the course shall not be listed on his or her transcript.

C. The Appeals Phase

The Student may appeal the determination of the Review Panel, the academic sanction determined by the Instructor, and/or the administrative sanction(s) determined by the appropriate administrative authority.

1. Appeal of the Determination of the Review Panel:

   An undergraduate student may appeal the Review Panel’s determination by submitting a written appeal to the Council of Provosts, with a copy to the AICAI Office, within five (5) business days of formal notification of the determination of the Review Panel. The AIC Office will forward the student’s appeal to the appropriate Provost. Council of Provosts will consider the appeal within ten (10) business days from the date the appeal was received. The decision of the Council of Provosts regarding the Student’s appeal shall be sent to the Student (via mail and email) in writing and copied to the Student’s Dean, the AICAI Office, and Academic Records.

   A graduate student may appeal the Review Panel’s determination by submitting a written appeal to the Dean of Graduate Studies, with a copy to the AICAI Office within five (5) business days of formal notification of the determination of the Review Panel. The AIC Office will forward the student’s appeal to the Dean of Graduate Studies. The Dean of Graduate Studies will consider the appeal within ten (10) business days from the date the appeal was received. The decision of the Dean of Graduate Studies shall be sent directly to the Student (via mail and email) in writing and copied to the Assistant Dean of Graduate Studies, the AICAI Office, and Academic Records.

   A non-matriculated student enrolled in a UCSD course through Summer Session or UCSD Extension may appeal the Review Panel’s determination by submitting a written appeal to the AICAI Office within five (5) business days of formal notification of the determination of the Review Panel. The AIC Office will forward the student’s appeal to the Council of Provosts for students enrolled through Summer Session and the Dean of Extension for students enrolled through UCSD Extension. The designated authority will consider the appeal within ten (10) business days from the date the appeal was received. The decision of the designated authority shall be sent directly to the Student in writing and copied to the appropriate administrative authority, the AICAI Office, and Academic Records.

   The basis for appeal of the Review Board’s determination shall be: (i) that standards of procedural fairness were violated, e.g., that the Student did not have sufficient opportunity to present his or her side of the case; or (ii) that there exists newly discovered important evidence that has substantial bearing on the determination of the Review Panel. If the appeal is sustained, the case shall be referred back to the AIC Office to schedule a new AIR before a new Review Panel. Except for such appeals, the determination of the Review Panel shall be final.

2. Appeal of the Academic Sanction:

   Appeals must be submitted to the Educational Policy Committee within five (5) business days of receiving notice from the AICAI Office of the academic sanction assigned. If the case was reviewed by a Review Panel, the Committee shall receive the determination of the Review Panel and accept its determination as to the facts of the case. The Educational Policy Committee shall consider the appeal in accordance with its established procedures.

3. Appeal of Administrative Sanction:

   An appeal of the administrative sanction(s) shall be submitted by an undergraduate student to the Council of Provosts with a copy to the AICAI Office within five (5) business days of receiving notice from the AIC of the administrative sanction. The Council of Provosts shall evaluate the Student’s appeal and make a final
decision within ten (10) business days of receiving the appeal. The decision of the Council of Provosts shall be sent by the Chair of the Council of Provosts to the Student (via mail and email) in writing and copied to the Dean, the AI Office, and Academic Records.

An appeal by a graduate student shall be directed to the Dean of Graduate Studies with a copy to the AI Office, within five (5) business days of receiving notice from the AIC of the administrative sanction. The Dean of Graduate Studies shall evaluate the Student’s appeal and make a decision within ten (10) business days of receiving the appeal. The decision of the Dean of Graduate Studies shall be sent to the Student (via mail and email) in writing and copied to the Assistant Dean of Graduate Studies, the AI Office, and Academic Records.

An appeal by a non-matriculated student enrolled in a UCSD course shall be directed to the Council of Provosts for students enrolled through Summer Session and the Dean of Extension for students enrolled through UCSD Extension, with a copy to the AI Office within five (5) business days of receiving notice from the AIC of the administrative sanction. The designated authority shall evaluate the Student’s appeal and make a decision within ten (10) business days of receiving the appeal. The decision of the designated authority shall be sent to the Student in writing and copied to the appropriate administrative authority, the AI Office, and Academic Records.

A decision of the Council of Provosts, or of the Dean of Graduate Studies, or Dean of Extension regarding an appeal is final.

VI. Policy Regarding Student Academic Records

• Until a charge of violating the Policy has been resolved, the Student’s transcript will show a blank grade for the course. Academic Records will note in attached text to the course (i.e., not on the Student’s transcript) that the hold is for a “Pending Charge of Academic Dishonesty”.

• While a hold is in effect, once a charge is filed with the AI Office, the Student shall not drop or withdraw from the course. If the Student drops the course before the charge of violating the Policy has been resolved, he or she will be administratively reenrolled in the course by Academic Records. If a student drops or withdraws from a course before a charge is filed with the AI Office, the resolution process will proceed as described in the Policy but no academic sanction will be applied.

• The faculty hold “Pending Charge of Academic Dishonesty” notation shall not be removed by Academic Records until notification from the AI Office that the case has been resolved or that the Instructor has withdrawn the charge.

• If a passing grade is assigned to a Student found responsible for violating the Policy and a conflict arises because of the Student’s enrollment in a duplicate, crosslisted, or equivalent course taken after the charge has been resolved, Academic Records shall drop the Student from the duplicate course or remove the grade for the duplicate course from the Student’s record. Ensure that the grade given in the course with the Academic Dishonesty charge is not removed from the GPA. All other academic regulations pertaining to duplicate course enrollment will be enforced.

• If the Student has been found responsible for violating the Policy, the grade assigned by the Instructor will be counted in the Student’s GPA even if the course is retaken. Academic Records will permanently note in text attached to the course (i.e., not on the Student’s transcript) that the grade was given as a result of “Academic Dishonesty”.

• If the Student withdraws from UCSD before the final resolution of the case, the following policy shall govern. If the Student is found responsible for violating the Policy and the Instructor assigns the Student a final grade in the course, this grade shall be permanently entered on the transcript. If the administrative sanction is dismissal, the transcript shall bear a notation that readmission is contingent upon approval from
the Chancellor. Any administrative penalty less severe than dismissal shall be imposed if and when the student returns to the University.

• If a case of alleged Policy violation is also the subject of an administrative inquiry under the Policy on Integrity of Research, then the Senior Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, in consultation with the Review Panel, may make such modifications in procedure as are necessary to coordinate the two inquiries.

• If the administrative sanction is suspension or dismissal, the fact that the Student was suspended or dismissed for violating the Policy must be posted on the academic transcript for the duration of the sanction.

VII. Review of this Policy

The Educational Policy Committee shall periodically review this Policy and propose changes as it deems necessary.

VIII. Academic Dishonesty in Independent Exams

In cases where academic dishonesty is reported in independent exams (exams held outside of coursework), such as placement exams and qualifying exams, the procedures described above shall apply, with exception to the language regarding administration of a grade as an academic sanction in section V.B.10.b and appeals of the academic sanction (section V.C.2).

A. Academic Sanctions

The academic sanction will be determined by the faculty member or faculty committee with ultimate responsibility for evaluating the exam. The sanction will establish the following:

1. Evaluation of exam results. This may include granting the student full, partial, or no credit for the exam.
2. Provision to allow or deny the student the ability to repeat the exam.

The responsible party shall report the academic sanction to the Student and the AI Office, which shall notify the appropriate administrative offices of the sanction (per Section V.B.10.b).

B. Appeals of the Academic Sanctions

Appeals of academic sanctions must be submitted to the Educational Policy Committee following the timelines specified in the section V.C.2 of the Policy.
REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGE AND TENURE

After much discussion and consultation, the Committee on Privilege and Tenure proposes the attached revision to Divisional Bylaw 230, Privilege and Tenure, which governs the composition of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure and its responsibilities.

The Committee is also governed by Academic Senate (systemwide) Bylaws 334, 335, 336 and 337. [http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/manual/bltoc.html](http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/manual/bltoc.html)

The proposed revision brings the Divisional bylaw into conformance with the systemwide bylaws by referencing those bylaws and supplementing them with local Divisional procedures where needed. In addition, the proposed Bylaw references policies contained in the Academic Personnel Manual for the Faculty Code of Conduct and the University Policy on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline, rather than attempting to repeat them within the Senate Bylaws, which should reflect Senate policy not the policy of the Administration.

Stefan Tanaka,
Chair
Committee on Privilege and Tenure

**************************
BYLAW

230. Privilege and Tenure [Am 5/24/88; Am 5/22/90]

(A) The Committee on Privilege and Tenure (“the committee”) has jurisdiction over grievance cases, disciplinary cases, and early termination cases, as provided in University of California Academic Senate Bylaw 334. The committee considers matters affecting the rights or privileges of Senate members, including allegations that a procedural violation occurred in a Senate member’s academic review. The principles and procedures governing the committee are set forth in University of California Academic Senate Bylaws 334, 335, 336 and 337. The Faculty Code of Conduct is set forth in the University of California Academic Personnel Manual Section 015, and the University Policy on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline is set forth in Section 016.

(B) Membership. The committee shall consist of seven ordinary members of the Division, none of whom is an officer of the Division or an officer of the Administration. In particular, the members shall not include the President of the University, the Chancellor at San Diego, the University Librarian, the Registrar, any Vice Chancellor, any current Dean, Associate Dean or Assistant Dean, any Provost, any Department Chair, nor any Director. No two members should be from the same department. One member of the committee shall serve on the University (systemwide) Committee on Privilege and Tenure, in accordance with University of California Academic Senate Bylaw 128(B) and San Diego Divisional Senate Bylaw 185(C)(8) [see Bylaw 185(C)(8) and SBL 195] [Am 4/28/92; Am 5/23/95; Am 2/24/04].

(C) The following Divisional procedures supplement the systemwide Academic Senate Bylaws.

(1) The Committee on Committees will annually appoint a panel of three advisors, is appointed each year by the Committee on Committees. A member of the panel may discuss the claim of violation of rights and privileges with the aggrieved Senate member and provide counsel on the appropriate procedures to be followed in accordance with this bylaw. Such advisors shall not serve as representatives of any complainant, nor may they be current members of the committee.

(2) Allegations of discrimination or sexual harassment of Senate members are referred to the Office for the Prevention of Harassment and Discrimination (OPHD) for investigation. A grievance tied to a discrimination or sexual harassment complaint is held in abeyance pending the outcome of the investigation, after which the OPHD finding is reported to the committee for consideration in the grievance proceeding.

(3) The chair of the committee will promote settlement of grievance cases on behalf of the committee or may delegate this authority to a committee member. Settlement discussions will not be admissible in any committee hearing.

(4) Upon conclusion of a hearing, if the committee finds that the Senate member’s rights and privileges have not been violated, but believes that conduct directed at the grievant was inconsistent with the campus’s Principles of Community, the committee may advise the Administration to take action to curtail such conduct.

(5) Report to the Division. The committee on Privilege and Tenure shall compile annually and submit a summary of its cases to Senate Council and to the University
Committee on Privilege and Tenure. the Division a report describing its rulings and decisions during the previous year, and the grounds therefor. Specifically, it will report the final disposition and shall also report the action taken by the Administration in each case. This report shall not name the faculty members involved in any case or provide any more identifying detail than is required to fully inform Senate Council and the University Committee on Privilege and Tenure the Division of the nature of the committee's actions and rulings.

(D) Links to bylaws, policies and principles referenced.

UC Academic Senate Bylaws 334, 335, 336 and 337  
http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/manual/bltoc.html

UC APM Section 015  
http://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel/_files/apm/apm-015.pdf

UC APM Section 016  
http://www.ucop.edu/academic-personnel/_files/apm/apm-016.pdf

UC Academic Senate Bylaw 128(B)  
http://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/manual/bltoc.html

San Diego Divisional Senate Bylaw 185(C)(8)  
http://senate.ucsd.edu/manual/bylaws/bylawstoc.htm

UCSD Principles of Community  
http://www.ucsd.edu/explore/about/principles.html
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(B) Jurisdiction.

(1) This committee shall advise the Chancellor at San Diego and the Division on general policies involving privilege or tenure of members of the Division.

(2) Grievance Cases

(a) Any member of the Academic Senate may complain to this committee that the member's rights or privileges have been violated. The committee may require that the complainant shall first exhaust all appropriate administrative avenues of redress.

(b) In cases of personnel review involving tenure, promotion, or reappointment, such complaints may be based only on allegations: (1) that the procedures were not consonant with the applicable rules and requirements of the University or any of its Divisions, and/or (2) that the challenged decision was reached on the basis of impermissible criteria, including -- but not limited to -- race, sex, or political conviction. The committee shall be empowered to determine the validity of the complaints under (1) or (2) but shall not be empowered to reevaluate the academic qualifications or professional competence of the complainant.

(3) Disciplinary Cases

In cases of disciplinary action commenced by the administration against a member of the Academic Senate, or against other faculty members in cases where the right to a hearing before a Senate committee is given by Section 103.9 or 103.10 of the Standing Orders of The Regents, proceedings shall be conducted before this committee.

(4) Early Termination Cases

In cases of proposed termination of a Senate or non-Senate faculty member before the expiration of the faculty member's contract, the faculty member may request a hearing before this committee.
The committee shall conduct a hearing on the case to determine whether, in its judgment, the proposed early termination is for good cause and has been recommended in accordance with a procedure that does not violate the privileges of the faculty member.

Procedures

(C) Extensions of Time Limits

The Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the chair of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure, on written mutual agreement, may grant a reasonable extension of any of the time limits designated in this Bylaw.

(D) Pre-Hearing Procedure in Grievance Cases

1. A grievance alleging a violation of a faculty member's privilege or tenure should be filed with the Committee on Privilege and Tenure within 180 calendar days of the action or incident giving rise to the complaint.

2. Upon receipt of a complaint, the Committee on Privilege and Tenure should first determine, within forty-five (45) calendar days, whether or not the complaining Senate member has made out a prima facie case. A prima facie case shall be deemed established if the committee concludes that there is sufficient reason to believe that a right or privilege of the complainant may have been violated. Upon an appropriate showing of need by any party or on its own initiative, the committee may request files and documents under the control of the administration, including the complainant's personnel files and confidential documents contained therein. Such confidential documents shall remain confidential within the committee.

3. The complainant shall have the right to appear before the committee. The committee may also ask other persons involved in the events that gave rise to the complaint, including the department chair, to appear for an informal hearing.

4. If the committee determines that the complainant has not made out a prima facie case of violation of a right or privilege, it shall advise the complainant to that effect in a written communication stating the reasons for its conclusion.

5. If the committee determines that the complainant has made out a prima facie case of violation of a right or privilege, the committee shall make an attempt to promote a settlement of the controversy between the complainant and the administrative officer, officers, or other persons concerned. If no settlement can be reached, the committee shall conduct a formal hearing, in accordance with the provisions set forth herein below under section 230(F).

(E) Pre-Hearing Procedures in Disciplinary Cases [En 4/27/76]

1. Introduction

These procedures shall be followed in all cases in which the imposition of discipline upon a member of the Academic Senate is sought because of an alleged violation of the Faculty Code (Appendix IV of the Manual of the Academic Senate). They are designed to meet the standards and requirements set forth in Academic Senate Bylaw 335 and Part III of the Faculty Code. The term "faculty member" in the following rules refers to members of the Academic Senate and those to whom the Standing Orders of The Regents give the right to a hearing before an Academic Senate committee. [All other officers of instruction are covered under Section 140 of the Academic Personnel Manual.] Types of discipline that may be imposed are listed in paragraph (F)(5) below. Except as herein provided, no discipline of any type shall be imposed on a faculty member except in accordance with these procedures. [Am 5/23/78]

2. Filing a Complaint

Complaints alleging conduct in violation of the Faculty Code, or the general rules and regulations of the University, may be initiated by any member of the University community. Except in unusual circumstances, complaints should be filed within 180 calendar days of the action or incident giving rise to the complaint. (Other time limits specified in procedures approved by the Academic Senate, e.g., sexual harassment, shall apply.) Complaints shall be filed with the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs (VCAA). Students, at their discretion, may file complaints either with the VCAA or the provost or dean of the college or school in which the student is enrolled.
The provost or dean shall immediately transmit any complaints of misconduct received by them to the VCAA.

(3) Notice to Parties
Within seven (7) calendar days of receiving it, the VCAA shall send a copy of the complaint, with the name of the accuser, to the faculty member charged.

(4) Probable Cause Investigation
(a) Investigating Party
The VCAA shall designate, within fourteen (14) calendar days, an investigating officer to conduct a preliminary investigation of the allegations of faculty misconduct, wherever originating, to determine whether there is probable cause and, if so, to process the charges against faculty members in accordance with the provisions herein. At the same time that the VCAA designates an investigating officer to investigate the complaint, he or she shall notify the chair of the Panel of Counselors [see paragraph (5)(b) below] and the chair of the academic department of the accused faculty member. In accordance with Part III, section 7, of the Faculty Code, the chair of the panel shall participate in an advisory role in the investigation of the allegations. Except as provided in paragraphs (6) and (7), the VCAA shall not participate in such investigations or in the processing of charges against a faculty member. The Senate and the Administration may agree to have other forms of preliminary investigation conducted by the Administration stand in lieu of appointment of and investigation by an investigating officer (e.g. when the complaint alleges sexual harassment). [Am 5/23/95]

(b) Determination of Probable Cause
The investigating officer shall determine, within thirty (30) calendar days, whether the complaint establishes probable cause. Probable cause is shown if a person of ordinary caution or prudence would be led to believe and conscientiously entertain a strong suspicion of a violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct, or the general rules and regulations of the University. Witnesses may be interviewed. [Am 5/23/95]

(c) Conference with the faculty member
If the investigating officer intends to recommend to the VCAA that charges be filed, the investigating officer shall, before making such recommendation, notify the faculty member in writing of such intention, including any written statements in support of the charges. The faculty member shall be invited to reply within fourteen (14) calendar days to the allegations in writing and/or in a personal conference. The faculty member and the investigating officer may agree on an informal resolution at this point, rather than have a mediator involved. [Am 5/23/95]

(5) Mediation
(a) In the case where other investigative procedures are followed (e.g. sexual harassment), this section shall not apply.

(b) Panel of Counselors
(i) There shall be a Panel of Counselors consisting of faculty members. It shall have a chair and four to seven members appointed by the Committee on Committees and approved by the Chancellor. The chair shall, if feasible, be a former member of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure. The Panel shall contain at least two non-tenured faculty members.

(ii) The chair shall participate in an advisory role in the investigation of any complaints made against a faculty member [see paragraph (4)(a) above].

(iii) The members of the Panel of Counselors shall serve as mediators in disciplinary cases as set forth in paragraph (5)(c) and (5)(d) below. The members do not normally meet as a group.

(iv) Members of the Panel of Counselors shall also serve as intermediaries required by the special procedures applicable when the Chancellor has invoked Section 626.4 of the California Penal Code or has imposed interim suspension with pay. These procedures are set forth in paragraph (G) below.

(c) Selection of a Mediator
Following receipt of notification [see Section (E)(4)(c)], either the accused or the investigating officer may request via the chair of the Panel of Counselors [see paragraph
(5)(b)] that a mediator from the Panel of Counselors be selected to aid in resolving differences between the parties through informal mediation. If the chair determines that the other party concurs in the request, he or she shall make such an appointment, in consultation with and with the approval of both parties, within seven (7) calendar days of receipt of notification.

d) Confidentiality of Mediation

In order to promote a free exchange of views, all aspects of the mediation shall be strictly confidential. Without limiting the foregoing:

(i) The mediator shall not disclose to either party any statements made to him or her by the other party without that other party's explicit consent; shall not make known any observations, conclusions, or recommendations he or she may have concerning the case to any person except the parties; and shall not discuss any aspect of the case with the chair or any member of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure or testify before said committee; and

(ii) The parties and their representatives shall not directly or indirectly make known to any other person any observations, conclusions, or recommendations submitted to any of them by the mediator.

(6) Informal Resolution

In the following cases (a) and (b) only, discipline can be imposed on a faculty member by an explicit agreement between the faculty member and the Chancellor following the recommendation of the investigating officer. The recommendation shall be submitted to the Chancellor within thirty (30) calendar days following the appointment of the mediator, if one is appointed. The chair of the Panel of Counselors shall also have the right to submit a recommendation to the Chancellor on the basis of his or her participation in the investigation. [Am 5/23/95]

(a) The investigating officer and the faculty member may arrive at a mutually agreeable settlement of the facts and issues, and on the discipline, if any, to be imposed on the faculty member pursuant to the settlement. Such agreement must be recorded in writing and must be signed by all parties. This agreement may or may not involve the use of a mediator. [Am 5/23/95]

(b) A faculty member has the right to accept a proposed discipline, which may be agreed upon through mediation, without signifying agreement on the facts and issues alleged against him or her. [Am 5/23/95]

(7) Filing Charges with the Committee on Privilege and Tenure

(a) If the matter is not resolved by agreement, the investigating officer shall recommend to the VCAA that charges be filed with the Committee on Privilege and Tenure. The VCAA will ask an investigating officer to prepare the charges and submit them to the Committee on Privilege and Tenure within thirty (30) calendar days. The investigating officer will file the charges with the Committee on Privilege and Tenure and represent the University administration in any hearings held by the Committee on Privilege and Tenure. In this latter capacity, the investigating officer may be represented by the Office of the General Counsel. Once charges are filed, the VCAA shall have no further contact with the matter (unless he or she is called as a witness). No discipline may be imposed on a faculty member, other than by agreement [see paragraph (6)], without a prior hearing before the Committee on Privilege and Tenure, the procedure for which is provided herein.

(b) Contents of Charges

The investigating officer shall prepare the charges, which shall specify the rule(s) violated and provide evidence of such violation. The charges shall then be filed with the Committee on Privilege and Tenure (hereinafter referred to as the "committee"). [Am 5/23/95]

(c) Service of Charges

Upon receipt of the charges, the chair of the committee shall arrange to have a copy delivered within seven (7) calendar days to the faculty member or send it by mail to the member's last known place of residence and to the faculty member's department chair. The committee chair is required to arrange the service of the complaint so that written proof of its delivery is received.
(d) Answer and Notice of Hearing

The faculty member shall have fourteen (14) calendar days from the date of receipt of the complaint in which to file an answer in writing to the committee, setting forth his or her position with respect to the conduct alleged. Upon receipt of the answer, or upon expiration of the fourteen-day period, the committee shall set a date for the hearing within sixty (60) calendar days. The defendant shall be given, either personally or by registered mail, at least ten (10) calendar days’ notice of the time and place of the hearing.

(8) Pre-Hearing Conference

With due notice, the hearing committee may, on the request of a party or on its own initiative, conduct a pre-hearing conference to clarify the procedures that will be followed in the hearing, at which time it may require the parties to define the issues, to outline their arguments, and to designate the witnesses they intend to call. This conference must take place within the sixty (60) day period specified in (E)(7)(d) above. [Am 5/23/95]

(E) Hearing and Post-Hearing Procedures

(1) Hearing Committee

The committee shall appoint a hearing committee for each case. The hearing committee may be the Committee on Privilege and Tenure or may be composed of at least five members selected from the membership of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure and an appointed panel of Division members. At least two of the members shall be members of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure, one of whom shall be chair of the hearing committee. A quorum for the conduct of the hearing shall consist of a majority of the hearing committee, including at least one member of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure. No member of the hearing committee shall sit on a matter that involves a member of his or her department or equivalent unit. If any member of the Committee on Privilege & Tenure is disqualified for any reason from hearing the case prior to the pre-hearing conference, the hearing committee may be appointed at that time.

(2) Assistance

The Committee on Privilege and Tenure may, in its discretion, request appointment of a qualified person or persons, with the approval of the Chair of the San Diego Division of the Academic Senate, to assist in the organization and conduct of the hearing.

(3) Participants

Each party shall be entitled to be present at all sessions of the hearing committee when evidence is being received and to select a representative who may act as counsel. In order to preserve the confidentiality of the hearing, persons whose presence is not essential to a determination of the facts shall, as a general rule, be excluded from the hearing.

(4) Conduct of Hearing and Rules of Evidence

(a) Although the hearing need not be conducted as a legal proceeding, each party shall have the right to present its case or defense by oral or documentary evidence, to submit rebuttal evidence, and to conduct such cross examination as may be required for a full and true disclosure of the facts.

(b) The hearing need not be conducted according to the technical legal rules relating to evidence and witnesses. The hearing committee may, upon an appropriate showing of need by any party or on its own initiative, request files and documents under the control of the administration. In hearings on grievances or early terminations, the identity of sources of personnel evaluations, insofar as they are confidential, shall remain so within the hearing committee. The hearing committee may call witnesses not referred to in the complaint or answer.

(c) No evidence other than that presented at the hearing shall be considered by the hearing committee or have weight in the proceedings, except that notice may be taken of any judicially noticeable fact. Parties present at the hearing shall be informed of matters thus noticed, and each party shall be given a reasonable opportunity to refute such matters. On all disputed questions of fact, the party making an allegation which is disputed shall have the burden of proving it by a preponderance of the evidence.

(5) Sanctions

Under Faculty Code, Part III, Section 12, the following disciplinary sanctions have been established: written censure; suspension (other than interim suspension with pay); demotion (in
rank or salary step); dismissal from the employ of the University. Authority for imposing the first
may be delegated by the Chancellor to the deans; authority for the second lies with the Chancellor
and cannot be delegated. Authority for imposing the third and fourth upon non-tenured faculty lies
with the Chancellor and cannot be delegated. Authority for imposing the third and fourth upon
tenured faculty lies with The Regents, acting on the recommendation of the President. [Am
5/23/95]

(6) Record of Hearing
The court-quality record of the proceedings will be made and the parties and their representatives
shall have the right to a copy. The cost of the copy shall be assumed by the requesting party. [Am
6/14/97]

(7) Recommendation
At the conclusion of the hearing, the hearing committee shall within thirty (30) calendar days
make its findings of fact, conclusions supported by a statement of reasons based on the evidence,
and recommendation, including its recommendation of sanction, if any, and forward these to the
Chancellor, the parties in the case, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, the chair of the
Divisional Committee on Privilege and Tenure, the chair of the University Committee on Privilege
and Tenure, and the chair of the academic department of the faculty member. In its findings, the
hearing committee should avoid naming faculty members not party to the case unless absolutely
necessary. Any faculty member so named who may be affected by the findings should be allowed
to comment before such findings are brought forward. [Am 1/25/94; 5/23/95]

(8) Confidentiality
The findings, conclusions, recommendation, and record of the proceeding shall be confidential;
the hearing committee may, however, authorize their release with the consent of the complainant
in a grievance case, with the consent of the defendant in a disciplinary case, and with the consent
of the faculty member involved in an early termination case. This proviso does not limit the
actions of anyone other than the members of the hearing committee, the members of the
Committee on Privilege and Tenure, and the officers and staff of the Academic Senate.

(9) Responses to Committee's Recommendation
(a) The investigating officer, the Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, or General Counsel
as his or her representative, and the faculty member may each comment on the
committee's findings and recommendation to the Chancellor within seven (7) calendar
days from receipt thereof. After such comment has been considered, or, if there is no
comment, after the expiration of such seven-day period, the Chancellor may impose the
discipline, if any, recommended by the committee. If in the opinion of the Chancellor
there are reasons which require a result different from that reached by the committee or a
sanction different from that recommended by the committee, he or she shall prepare a
written statement setting forth such reasons, and his or her specific objections, and return
the case, with such statement, to the committee, transmitting a copy of the statement to
the persons named in paragraph (E)(7). Within thirty (30) days after receipt of such
statement, the committee shall reconsider the case, taking into account the reasons and
objections of the Chancellor. On such reconsideration, the committee shall entertain
argument by the parties, either orally or in writing, on any issues not presented at the first
hearing. It shall not, however, revise its findings of fact except insofar as it determines
that the reasons and objections of the Chancellor require additional findings of fact on
issues not considered at the first hearing, in which case the committee shall receive
evidence with respect to such matters. The committee shall then submit its findings and
conclusions on reconsideration, which will be distributed in the same manner as the
original findings and conclusions. The Chancellor shall then make his or her final
decision, within fourteen (14) calendar days of receipt of the committee's final findings
and recommendations, taking into account the committee's action on reconsideration.
[Am 5/23/95]

(b) A comparable procedure shall be followed in any case in which the discipline in question
can be imposed only by The Regents on recommendation of the President.

(G) Special Procedures to be Used When the Chancellor has Invoked Section 626.4 of the California Penal
Code or has Imposed Interim Suspension
By agreement with the Academic Senate, the Chancellor will invoke the penal law against trespass, denying a person access to the campus, only in the most extreme cases where no alternative action will adequately protect the University and its community. When Section 626.4 is invoked, the following procedures shall be followed:

(a) At the same time that the Chancellor or his or her designated representative informs the person that the statute has been invoked barring him or her from campus, the person shall also be informed that under special circumstances, he or she may enter the campus (to retrieve personal effects or to take care of urgent business related to laboratory or professional work or to collect evidence on his or her behalf) in the company of a member of the Panel of Counselors [see paragraph (E)(5)(a) above] or of some person acceptable to the administration. The counselor, or other person chosen, shall ensure that the person barred from campus under Section 626.4 does not abuse the privilege extended to him or her under this section.

(b) As soon as Section 626.4 has been invoked, the Chancellor or his or her representative shall prepare a written notice to be delivered, by hand or telegram, to the person barred from campus. The notice shall contain (1) a statement that the person is barred from campus with a specification of the length of time the prohibition will run, (2) an explanation of the reasons for which the action has been taken under Section 626.4, (3) an explanation of the privileges (a) to come on campus in the company of a member of the Panel of Counselors to take care of urgent business and (b) to use a member of the Panel as an intermediary in dealings with the Chancellor and the administration (this section of the written notice shall also contain the name of the Panel's chair), and (4) the names of the chairs of the Academic Senate Committees on Privilege and Tenure and on Academic Freedom.

(c) The Chancellor's action under Section 626.4 does not constitute a disciplinary action under Regental and Academic Senate rules. Any attempt to impose discipline will proceed under the rules set out in paragraphs (E)(3) through (E)(11) above.

Aside from the extraordinary authority given to the Chancellor under Section 626.4 of the Penal Code, he or she has the right to impose on any faculty member an interim suspension with pay. This action shall be taken to protect the University and its community from the alleged deleterious effects of a faculty member's behavior. To invoke an interim suspension is to charge a faculty member with a violation of the Faculty Code, and when such a suspension has been imposed, the following rules will be applied.

(a) The Chancellor or his or her representative shall inform the faculty member of his or her suspension with pay in writing delivered in person, by telegram, or by registered mail to the person's last known address. The notice of suspension shall contain (1) a statement of suspension and of its length, (2) an explanation of the reasons for which the suspension was imposed, (3) an explanation of the rights the faculty member has for gaining reinstatement of his or her privileges as a faculty member (4) notice of the availability of the Panel of Counselors, with a list of its current members, to act as intermediaries between the suspended person and the administration.

(b) Within five (5) working days of the suspension, the suspended person shall decide whether to ask the Committee on Privilege and Tenure to hold a hearing on the charges of misconduct underlying the Chancellor's action or to make an informal agreement with the Chancellor concerning disciplinary action to be taken. If the suspended faculty member fails to initiate discussions designed to come to an informal agreement with the administration [under the provisions of paragraphs (E)(4) through (E)(5) above] within the specified time period, the Chancellor shall immediately refer the matter to the Committee on Privilege and Tenure. The case shall then be treated under the provisions of paragraphs (E)(7) through (E)(8) above.

(c) Interim suspension with pay is not a disciplinary action under these rules. It is an action taken by the Chancellor pending disposition of his allegations that a faculty member has seriously violated and will most likely continue to violate the Faculty Code.

[see C5 above]
REPORT OF THE SIXTH COLLEGE FACULTY

The proposed changes to the Sixth College bylaws were approved by a vote of the Sixth College Faculty in April 2014.

The rationale for the proposed revisions can be summarized as follows:

Revisions are proposed to the Sixth College Bylaws to amend Division Manual Appendix V – Bylaws of the Faculty of Sixth College. The proposed changes provide for electronic or mail ballot voting mechanisms, consistent with recent changes in the Academic Senate rules. These changes are appropriate since they allow for faculty participation and broader communication tools.

Geoffrey Cook, Executive Committee Member
Sixth College

*******************************************************

APPENDIX V
BYLAWS OF THE FACULTY OF SIXTH COLLEGE
(Approved by the San Diego Division 4/29/03)

I. MEMBERSHIP
All members of the San Diego Division of the Academic Senate appointed to Sixth College are voting members of the Sixth College Faculty.

II. FUNCTION
The faculty shall be concerned with the academic program of Sixth College and all related aspects of its educational environment.

III. FACULTY MEETINGS
At least one Faculty meeting per year shall be called by the Provost. Meetings can also be called by the Executive Committee, or by the written request of ten members of the Sixth College Faculty.

IV. QUORUM
The presence of 20% of the membership or a minimum of ten members of the faculty shall constitute a quorum.

V. OFFICERS AND COMMITTEES
A. A member of the Faculty of Sixth College shall be elected by the Faculty each year to serve as Chair of the Faculty effective from September 1st. The Chair of the Faculty shall preside at all meetings of the Faculty and of the Executive Committee.

B. The Executive Committee of the Faculty of Sixth College shall consist of the Chair of the Faculty, five additional elected faculty members and, ex officio, the Provost. Two students, selected by the Sixth students in a representative manner, shall be student representatives to the Executive Committee and shall be invited to meet regularly with it.

The elected members of the Executive Committee shall normally serve two-year terms. The faculty members should represent the five academic divisions of the UCSD General Campus, and none, apart from the Provost and the Chair of the Faculty, may be members of the same department. Student representatives shall serve no more than two one-year terms.
The Executive Committee, or any member of it, may call meetings of the Sixth College Faculty. The Executive Committee shall have authority to appoint ad hoc committees, which, like those appointed at Faculty meetings, shall report to the Sixth College Faculty and may be instructed to report to the Executive Committee.

C. Nominations for election as Chair of the Faculty and members of the Executive Committee shall take place at the annual meeting of the faculty. Election shall be by mail ballot. Elections to the Executive Committee shall be conducted in such a manner that three members who have served for one year are continued in office for another year and three new members replace those who have served for two years. If an elected member of the Executive Committee, who has served for less than two years, is elected as Chair of the Faculty, another member of the Faculty shall be elected to the Executive Committee for a new two-year term.

VI. RULES OF ORDER

*Robert's Rules of Order* shall govern the transaction of business, except for modification of these Bylaws or the Academic Plan of Sixth College. At the request of a majority of the voting members present at a faculty meeting, the question before the meeting shall be submitted to a mail ballot of the faculty.

VII. ACADEMIC PLAN

Changes in the Sixth College Academic Plan shall be approved for submission to the Academic Senate Undergraduate Council by a majority vote at a faculty meeting, provided that the faculty has been notified of the meeting and the proposed change at least five days of instruction prior to the meeting. [Am. 3/1/11]

VIII. AMENDMENT OF BYLAWS

The procedure for amendment of these Bylaws shall be the same as for changes in the Academic Plan, except that a two-thirds majority is required.

IX. MAIL BALLOTS BY THE FACULTY OF SIXTH COLLEGE

Throughout these Bylaws the term “mail ballot” or “ballot” shall denote either a mail or electronic ballot.