

University Senate Meeting
March 6, 2023
WebEx Virtual Meeting

Call to Order

Moderator **Dineen** called the meeting to order at 4:01 p.m.

1. Approval of Minutes

- February 6, 2023 University Senate meeting
The minutes of the meeting were approved as distributed.

2. Report of the President

Presented by Provost Anne D'Alleva

Provost **D'Alleva** shared that the budget is the President's top priority, and she is meeting diligently with Legislators and working with OPM to address the budget shortfall. The Provost will be opening a search for the position of Vice President for Research, Innovation, and Entrepreneurship, a position that Pamir Alpay has been serving as interim since February of 2022. This will be an internal search with an announcement coming shortly.

Provost **D'Alleva** continued by stating that four candidates for the Dean of the School of Nursing were interviewed this past week. Candidates for the Dean of the School of Social Work will be coming for on-campus interviews towards the end of March. The search for the Dean of the School of Fine Arts will be launched in late spring, and the Dean of the School of Engineering search will be launched shortly after.

Provost **D'Alleva** provided an update on the efforts to address food insecurity on campus. She thanked Mike White, Director of Dining Services, for partnering in this effort along with representatives from USG who have been staunch advocates around the issue of food insecurity. There will be Husky Harvest Food Pantry on the Storrs campus by the end of March in the Charter Oak Apartments. The location has parking available and there is a shuttle bus stop there. Consideration is being given to a second location on campus.

Provost **D'Alleva** highlighted the Life Transformative Education and Cultivate LTE event that happened last week.

Moderator **Dineen** invited questions from the floor.

Senator **Siegle** mentioned joining the students when they went to the Capitol and he asked for the Provost's reaction to that event. Provost **D'Alleva** shared that she could not have been more proud of the students.

Senator **MacDougald** asked if there is a follow-up plan to engage the students further and have their questions heard. Provost **D'Alleva** said that there will be further opportunities for students to submit testimony, as there are various Legislative sub-committees that have been formed. It is very easy to provide written testimony to these sub-committees. The students' voices must be heard during the weeks to come.

Moderator **Dineen** thanked Provost **D'Alleva** for the presentation.

3. Report of the Senate Executive Committee

Attachment #1

Presented by SEC Chair Del Siegle

Senator **Dormidontova** asked what determines the representation of faculty from different departments in the Senate. Senator **Siegle** stated that each school has designated positions and then there are general positions elected to the Senate. Senator Administrator Cheryl **Galli** was recognized by the Moderator and stated that Because of its size, CLAS is handled differently than other schools & colleges. Faculty are elected from within sub-constituencies: Humanities & Centers/Institutes, Social Sciences, Life and Physical Sciences. The Senate Office identifies the number of available seats (as prescribed in the By-laws) and the CLAS Dean's Office puts the ballots together. There is an opportunity to nominate a colleague or self-nominate as well.

4. Question & Answers with UConn Board of Trustees Chair Dan Toscano

Senator **Siegle** introduced Chair Dan **Toscano**. Moderator **Dineen** began the discussion with questions submitted to the Senate Office.

A recording of the discussion can be found [here](#).

5. Consent Agenda Items:

Attachment #2

Report of the Senate Curricula and Courses Committee

By voice vote, the consent agenda passed unanimously.

Moderator **Dineen** called for any new business.
There was no new business.

6. Scholastic Standards

Vote on a motion to amend the By-Laws, Rules, and Regulations of the University Senate, II.B.12, Readmission

Attachment #3

Presented by Scholastic Standards Committee Member Lindsey Cummings

Senator **Cummings** presented the motion.

Senator **Keilty** asked if this proposal affects the eight-year rule. Senator **Cummings** stated that it does not change that rule.

Senator **Caruso** asked if a student who is applying for an academic renewal after being separated from the University based on their scholastic standing will need to complete [at least] the 12 credits as a non-degree or at another institution to be eligible for this readmission. Senator **Cummings** confirmed that they would need to complete the 12 credits if they were separated for scholastic standing, but this would also cover students who left the University for personal reasons.

Senator **Bacher** wanted to clarify that students cannot remove partial credit to get to the 16 credits. Senator **Cummings** confirmed.

The vote on the motion passed; 67-yes, 0-no, 0-abstentions.

7. Vote on a motion to amend the By-Laws, Rules, and Regulations of the University Senate, II.D.11, Cheating – Student Academic Misconduct

Presented by Senator Gladis Kersaint and Scholastic Standards Committee Member Holly Fitch

Attachment #4

Senator **Kersaint** presented the motion.

Senator **Burkey** asked about the implementation costs. Senator **Kersaint** stated that the major shift will be the addition of the Academic Integrity Standing Committee within the Provost's Office, which would include approximately 40 individuals who will serve on hearing panels.

Senator **Holle** shared that the School of Pharmacy has its own Technical Standards Committee and asked how that committee fits in with the policy and processes. Senator **Kersaint** clarified that the document addresses the additional standards of professional schools and that the committees within these schools would still address issues associated with those specific standards.

Senator **Keilty** shared his reservations about the Committee being situated in the Provost's Office. Senator **Kersaint** stated that the Committee is not involved in the hearing but is part of the appellant process. This Committee would be used as a sounding board for addressing academic issues more broadly and would involve students and faculty more broadly.

Senator **Morrell** asked about the costs associated with this proposal. He also asked if there was a discussion about the automatic required reporting in cases that involved minor issues. Senator **Kersaint** stated that the first step of the procedure begins with a conversation between faculty and students. If nothing more is needed, the issue is considered resolved. However, if the instructor finds that a student is in violation, they would report it. This is consistent with the current policy. Senator **Kersaint** further stated that there will be a new position for the Director and administrative support, but the fixed cost for this is not known yet.

Senator **Fitch** clarified that faculty do have the discretion to determine issues, such as improper citations of resources, as falling below the standard of academic misconduct. There is still room for a category of smaller infractions that will be dealt with between instructor and student.

Senator **Dormidontova** stated that it appears that misconduct has been merged into one policy, however, research misconduct versus academic misconduct is quite different. She asked if it is practical to combine these into one policy. Senator **Kersaint** stated that OVPR has a separate policy that deals with research misconduct, but in using this policy there is some discretion that the faculty must make in terms of the nature of the behavior.

Senator **Morrell** addressed concern for the cost of this policy and made a motion to table this vote until a cost estimate can be provided, given the current fiscal situation. Senator **Dormidontova** seconded the motion.

The vote to table the motion passed; 30-Yes, 20-No, 4-abstentions

8. Report from Anti-Black Racism Course Working Group Attachment #5

Presented by Co-chairs Shawn Salvant and Stephany Santos

Professors **Salvant** and **Santos** shared a presentation entitled, "Proposed By-Law Change to Require the Anti-Black Racism Course for All Undergraduate Students". Senator **Holland** and Senator **Engler** provided additional information regarding the development of the course, the first offering, and its impact on the students moving forward.

Senator **Ulloa** asked if the Committee has thought about possible legal implications for requiring all undergraduate students to take this course. Professor **Salvant** stated that he was not aware of any legal implications as there are already courses that are required for undergraduate students to take that are outside of their major as part of the general education structure.

Senator **Burkey** said he thought it would be helpful in the final presentation to estimate the number of students per semester that are expected to enroll in the class to identify whether or not \$50K would be enough to support that course.

Senator **Bacher** referenced the 2020 microaggression survey and noted the creation of several pop-up courses created to address different concerns around racist activities. She asked why this can't be a choice-based mandate where students select a course from among a pantry of options. Professor **Santos** stated that the report of bias incidents on campus shows that race and ethnicity (specifically black racism) is by far the greatest number of occurrences on campus. That is why this course was chosen. Students are encouraged to consider other one-credit courses as well.

Senator **Bayulgen** asked if there is a precedent for this class being the first course that all undergraduate students would be required to take. Professor **Salvant** stated that to his knowledge this would be the first single course required for all undergraduate students.

Moderator **Dineen** stated that additional questions should be forwarded to the Senate Office and Cheryl will make sure they are sent to the presenters before the April meeting.

9. New Business

10.Adjournment

Senator **Morrell** made a motion to adjourn.

Senator **Keilty** seconded.

Motion passed unanimously.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:07 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Christine S. North

Secretary of the University Senate, 2022-2023

SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Del Siegle, Chair

Usman Ali

Gabrielle Corso

Kate Fuller

Carl Rivers

Manuela Wagner

Pam Bramble

Jason Chang

Mason Holland

Margaret Rubega

Laura Burton

Marisa Chrysochoou

Joe MacDougald

Peter Spinelli

University Senate Curricula and Courses Committee
Report to the Senate
March 6, 2023

I. The Senate Curricula and Courses Committee recommends ADDITION of the following 1000- or 2000-level courses:

A. ARE 2155 Competition and Behavioral Economics (#16285)

Proposed Catalog Copy

ARE 2155. Imperfect Competition and Behavioral Economics

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: ARE 2150 or ECON 2201 or ECON 2211Q

Grading Basis: Graded

Extension of intermediate microeconomic theory to include noncompetitive markets and psychology to consumer behavior. Topics include monopolies and oligopolies (and their welfare implications); game theory (including adverse selection and moral hazard); and behavioral economics (such as time inconsistency, loss aversion, and pro-social preferences). Emphasis will be placed on real-world applications of theory in agriculture, health, natural resources, and the environment.

B. CHEG 2201 Chemical Engineering Professional Skills I (#17545)

Proposed Catalog Copy

CHEG 2201. Chemical Engineering Professional Skills I

1.00 credit

Prerequisites: CHEM 1128Q, or CHEM 1125 and 1126; MATH 1132; open only to chemical engineering students

Grading Basis: Graded

Professional skills necessary to succeed in the chemical engineering industry: written and oral technical communication; working on diverse and inclusive teams. The complexity of these skills will build over CHEG 2201, 3201, and 4101.

C. ECON 2413 Economics of Financial Markets and Institutions (#16945)

Proposed Catalog Copy

ECON 2413. Economics of Financial Markets and Institutions

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: ECON 1200 or both ECON 1201 (or ARE 1150) and ECON 1202

Grading Basis: Graded

Interactions between the financial system and the real economy. The form and function of various financial markets and financial institutions Theories of interest rates. Theories of asymmetric information and transaction cost. The evolving role of the financial system in understanding key macroeconomic phenomena.

D. JOUR 2040 Fundamentals of News Programming (#16785)

Proposed Catalog Copy

JOUR 2040. Fundamentals of News Programming

3.00 Credits

Prerequisites: Open to sophomores or higher. Recommended preparation: JOUR 1002 and/or JOUR 2000W. Not open for credit to students who have passed JOUR 2095 when offered as TV & Video News Programming.

Grading Basis: Graded.

Exploration of the practical steps required to build a professional newscast for TV, radio, or digital distribution.

E. JOUR 2575 The Art of the Interview in Documentary Filmmaking (#16767)

Proposed Catalog Copy

JOUR 2575. The Art of the Interview in Documentary Filmmaking

3.00 Credits

Prerequisites: Open to sophomores or higher. Recommended Preparation: JOUR 2000W, 2111. Not open for credit to students who have passed JOUR 2095 when offered as Art of Interview in Documentary Filmmaking.

Grading Basis: Graded

Exploration of the technical and ethical practices of preparing for and conducting filmed interviews. Development of essential skills for documentary film production and engagement in exercises that deepen understanding of how recorded interviews drive narratives forward.

F. PNB 1201 Learning by Experiencing and Applying Physiological Principles I (#11885)

Proposed Catalog Copy

PNB 1201. Learning by Experiencing and Applying Physiological Principles I

1.00 Credits

Prerequisites: None

Grading Basis: Graded

Introduction to the principles governing gene organization, regulation of transcription, transcript processing, protein production, protein function, and outputs of physiological interest.

G. PNB 2201 Learning by Experiencing and Applying Physiological Principles II (#11886)

Proposed Catalog Copy

PNB 2201. Learning by Experiencing and Applying Physiological Principles II

2.00 Credits

Prerequisites: PNB 1201

Grading Basis: Graded

Exploration of the role that gene regulation, transcript processing, protein production, and protein function play in the physiology of limb development. Emphasis placed on understanding and communicating primary literature, and experimental systems used in model organisms.

H. URBN 1600 Cities of Imagination (#15805)

Proposed Catalog Copy

URBN 1600. Cities of Imagination

3.00 credits.

Prerequisites: None.

Grading Basis: Graded.

Introduction to planned cities. Topics may include concepts in urban planning, past and present planned cities, considerations of ethics and inclusion in planning. CA 2.

II. The Senate Curricula and Courses Committee recommends REVISION of the following 1000- or 2000-level courses:

- A. ENGL 2610/DMD 2610/(HIST 2102) Introduction to Digital Humanities (#13985) [Add cross-listing for HIST]

Current Catalog Copy

ENGL 2610. Introduction to Digital Humanities

Also offered as: DMD 2610

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: None.

Grading Basis: Graded

The application of digital technology and media to such subjects as art history, classics, cultural and area studies, history, languages, literature, music, and philosophy. This course will provide a broad survey of the landscape of international and interdisciplinary digital humanities through the lens of ongoing work of faculty and staff researchers at the University of Connecticut.

DMD 2610. Introduction to Digital Humanities

Also offered as: ENGL 2610

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: None.

Grading Basis: Graded

The application of digital technology and media to such subjects as art history, classics, cultural and area studies, history, languages, literature, music, and philosophy. This course will provide a broad survey of the landscape of international and interdisciplinary digital humanities through the lens of ongoing work of faculty and staff researchers at the University of Connecticut.

Revised Catalog Copy

ENGL 2610. Introduction to Digital Humanities

Also offered as: DMD 2610, HIST 2102

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: None.

Grading Basis: Graded

The application of digital technology and media to such subjects as art history, classics, cultural and area studies, history, languages, literature, music, and philosophy. This course will provide a broad survey of the landscape of international and interdisciplinary digital humanities through the lens of ongoing work of faculty and staff researchers at the University of Connecticut.

DMD 2610. Introduction to Digital Humanities

Also offered as: ENGL 2610, HIST 2102

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: None.

Grading Basis: Graded

The application of digital technology and media to such subjects as art history, classics, cultural and area studies, history, languages, literature, music, and philosophy. This course will provide a broad survey of the landscape of international and interdisciplinary digital humanities through the lens of ongoing work of faculty and staff researchers at the University of Connecticut.

HIST 2102. Introduction to Digital Humanities

Also offered as: ENGL 2610, DMD 2610

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: None.

Grading Basis: Graded

The application of digital technology and media to such subjects as art history, classics, cultural and area studies, history, languages, literature, music, and philosophy. This course will provide a broad survey of the landscape of international and interdisciplinary digital humanities through the lens of ongoing work of faculty and staff researchers at the University of Connecticut.

B. PNB 1000 Introduction to Physiology & Neurobiology (#14485) [Revise credits, title, catalog copy]

Current Catalog Copy

PNB 1000. Introduction to Physiology and Neurobiology

1.00 credits

Prerequisites: Open to first-year students, others with consent of instructor.

Grading Basis: Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory

An introduction for declared and prospective Physiology and Neurobiology majors. Introduces key discoveries, current research areas, and technological innovations in physiology and neurobiology, and develops familiarity with the PNB department. Students taking this course will be assigned a final grade of S (satisfactory) or U (unsatisfactory).

Revised Catalog Copy

PNB 1000. Introduction to Academic and Scientific Methods in Physiology and Neurobiology

2.00 credits

Prerequisites: Open to first-year students majoring in Physiology and Neurobiology, others with consent of instructor.

Grading Basis: Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory

A project-based introduction to scientific methods for first-year declared and prospective Physiology and Neurobiology students. May include discussions of educational and laboratory based research in Physiology and Neurobiology.

III. The Senate Curricula and Courses Committee recommends DELETION of the following 1000- or 2000-level courses:

- A. ENGL 2011 Honors I: Literary Study Through Reading and Research (#14865)

IV. The General Education Oversight Committee and the Senate Curricula and Courses Committee recommend ADDITION of the following 3000- or 4000-level existing courses within or into the General Education curriculum:

- A. HIST 3994W Junior Seminar (#15945)

Proposed Catalog Copy

HIST 3994W. Junior Seminar

3.00 Credits

Prerequisites: HIST 2100, which may be taken concurrently with consent of instructor; ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011.

Grading Basis: Graded

Analytical, research, and writing skills needed for the major's capstone course, HIST 4994W.

- B. KINS 3531W Scientific Writing in Aerobic Training for Health and Performance (#14866)

Proposed Catalog Copy

KINS 3531W. Scientific Writing in Aerobic Training for Health and Performance.

1.00 credit.

Prerequisites: KINS 4500; ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011; open only to students in Kinesiology programs, others by consent of instructor. Corequisite: KINS 3530. Not open for credit to students who have passed KINS 3530W.

Grading Basis: Graded

A writing intensive class integrated with course content in KINS 3530.

- C. KINS 3546W Scientific Writing in Resistance Training for Health and Performance (#14886)

Proposed Catalog Copy

KINS 3546W. Scientific Writing in Resistance Training for Health and Performance.

1.00 credits.

Prerequisites: KINS 4500; ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011; open only to students in Kinesiology programs. Corequisite: KINS 3545. Not open for credit to students who have passed KINS 3545W.

Grading Basis: Graded

A writing intensive class integrated with course content in KINS 3545.

V. The General Education Oversight Committee and the Senate Curricula and Courses Committee recommend REVISION of the following 3000- or 4000-level existing courses within or into the General Education curriculum:

- A. ARTH/AMST 3440/W 19th Century American Art (#14405) [Revise title and description]

Current Catalog Copy

ARTH 3440. 19th Century American Art

Also offered as: AMST 3440.

3.00 credits.

Prerequisites: Open to sophomores or higher.

Grading Basis: Graded

An overview of major artists and stylistic movements in the United States in the long 19th century.

AMST 3440. 19th Century American Art

Also offered as: ARTH 3440.

3.00 credits.

Prerequisites: Open to sophomores or higher.

Grading Basis: Graded

An overview of major artists and stylistic movements in the United States in the long 19th century.

ARTH 3440W. 19th Century American Art

Also offered as: AMST 3440W.

3.00 credits.

Prerequisites: ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011 or 2011; open to juniors or higher.

Grading Basis: Graded

An overview of major artists and stylistic movements in the United States in the long 19th century.

AMST 3440W. 19th Century American Art

Also offered as: ARTH 3440W.

3.00 credits.

Prerequisites: ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011 or 2011; open to juniors or higher.

Grading Basis: Graded

An overview of major artists and stylistic movements in the United States in the long 19th century.

Revised Catalog Copy

ARTH 3440. Visual Culture of the United States, 19th Century

Also offered as: AMST 3440

3.00 credits.

Prerequisites: Open to sophomores or higher.

Grading Basis: Graded

An exploration of how visual culture in the long 19th century contributed to the formation of the United States.

AMST 3440. Visual Culture of the United States, 19th Century

Also offered as: ARTH 3440

3.00 credits.

Prerequisites: Open to sophomores or higher.

Grading Basis: Graded

An exploration of how visual culture in the long 19th century contributed to the formation of the United States.

ARTH 3440W. Visual Culture of the United States, 19th Century

Also offered as: AMST 3440W.

3.00 credits.

Prerequisites: ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011; open to juniors or higher.

Grading Basis: Graded

An exploration of how visual culture in the long 19th century contributed to the formation of the United States.

AMST 3440W. Visual Culture of the United States, 19th Century

Also offered as: ARTH 3440W.

3.00 credits.

Prerequisites: ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011; open to juniors or higher.

Grading Basis: Graded

An exploration of how visual culture in the long 19th century contributed to the formation of the United States.

B. CSE 4939W Capstone Design Project I [W] (#14628) [Revise prereqs]

Current Catalog Copy

CSE 4939W. Computer Science and Engineering Design Project I

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: CSE 3100, 3500; open to seniors; ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011 or 2011.

Grading Basis: Graded

The first semester of the required two-semester major design experience. Working on a team, students will propose, design, produce, and evaluate a software and/or hardware system. Will culminate in the delivery of the design, analysis, and initial working system, to be used as a basis for CSE 4940, formal public presentation, and written documentation. Oral and written progress reports are required.

Revised Catalog Copy

CSE 4939W. Computer Science and Engineering Design Project I

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: CSE 3100, 3500; ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011; open only to seniors; open only to Computer Science and Engineering majors and Computer Science majors.

Grading Basis: Graded

The first semester of the required two-semester major design experience. Working on a team, students will propose, design, produce, and evaluate a software and/or hardware system. Will culminate in the delivery of the design, analysis, and initial working system, to be used as a basis for CSE 4940, formal public presentation, and written documentation. Oral and written progress reports are required.

- C. GEOG 3350E Global Change, Local Action: A Geography of Environmentalism (#16388) [Revise description and add EL]

Current Catalog Copy

GEOG 3350. Global Change, Local Action: A Geography of Environmentalism

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: None.

Grading Basis: Graded

How global-local linkages of geographic scope and scale impact human-environment interactions.

Revised Catalog Copy

GEOG 3350E. Global Change, Local Action: A Geography of Environmentalism

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: None.

Grading Basis: Graded

A systems thinking approach exploring global-local linkages of environmental politics and human-environmental interactions across scales using case studies and future modeling simulations.

Emphasis will be placed on stakeholders and community-based initiatives to achieve environmental justice and sustainability.

- D. NRE 4697W Undergraduate Research Thesis in Natural Resources [W] (#12885) [Revise prereqs]

Current Catalog Copy

NRE 4697W. Undergraduate Research Thesis in Natural Resources

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: Three credits of either NRE 3699 or 4689, which may be taken concurrently; ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011 or 2011; open to juniors or higher.

Grading Basis: Graded

Writing of a formal thesis based on independent research conducted by the student. Thesis proposal and final thesis must follow guidelines developed by the Department; and be submitted to, and approved by, a department review committee.

Revised Catalog Copy

NRE 4697W. Undergraduate Research Thesis in Natural Resources

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: Three credits of either NRE 3699 or 4696, which may be taken concurrently; ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011; open to juniors or higher.

Grading Basis: Graded

Writing a formal thesis based on independent research conducted by the student. Thesis proposal and final thesis must follow guidelines developed by the Department; and be submitted to, and approved by, a department review committee.

- E. NUSC 4296W Senior Thesis in Nutrition [W] (#16486) [Revise prereqs – remove restrictions, revise number and catalog copy]

Current Catalog Copy

NUSC 4296W. Senior Thesis in Nutrition

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011 or 2011; open only to Nutritional Sciences honors students.

Grading Basis: Honors Credit

Consent of honor advisor and department head required.

Revised Catalog Copy

NUSC 4297W. Senior Thesis in Nutrition

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011.

Grading Basis: Honors Credit

Consent of honor advisor required.

VI. The General Education Oversight Committee recommends DELETION of the following 3000- and 4000- Level Courses:

- A. KINS 3530W Aerobic Training for Health and Performance (#14866)
B. KINS 3545W Resistance Training for Health and Performance (#14886)

VII. The Senate Curricula and Courses Committee recommend ADDITION of the following S/U Graded Courses:

- A. ARE 4900 Farm Credit Fellows Seminar (#17465)

Proposed Catalog Copy

ARE 4900. Farm Credit Fellows Seminar

1.00 credit

Prerequisites: One or more of the following courses: ARE 2150, ARE 2210, ARE 2215, ACCT 2001, BADM 3730, or FNCE 3101.

Grading Basis: Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory

Offered with Farm Credit East; ag-credit concepts from the lender's perspective.

Respectfully Submitted by the 22-23 Senate Curricula and Courses Committee: Suzanne Wilson (Chair), John Chandy, Louis Hanzlik, Matt McKenzie, Tina Reardon, Pam Bedore (Ex-Officio), Peter Diplock (ex-officio), Marc Hatfield, David Ouimette, Sharyn Rusch, Eric Schultz, Steve Stifano (C&C Chair), *Terra Zuidema* (Registrar alternate), and Karen McDermott (Program Assistant)

From the 2/6/23 and 2/20/23 meetings.

**Scholastic Standards Committee
To the University Senate
Approved March 6, 2023**

Background:

The Scholastic Standards Committee proposes to add academic renewal option to the By-Laws, Rules, and Regulations of the University Senate. This academic renewal option, which is known at some universities as fresh start, academic forgiveness, or academic clemency, allows students who have been separated from the university for a significant period to omit a certain number of courses from GPA calculation. The option is designed to provide motivation, incentive, and access for those students hoping to return to UConn to complete their degree. It would allow students to represent their academic work more clearly at the point and time they are completing their degree and remove barriers, both real and perceived, to degree completion.

An academic renewal option has been under consideration by the University since at least 2018. The current committee feels that the implementation of the policy is particularly timely, given the Covid-19 pandemic and its impact on students.

Many of our peer and aspirant institutions have an academic renewal or fresh start option, including Indiana University, Purdue University, University of Georgia, University of Kansas, Ohio State University, Pennsylvania State University, and University of Maryland.

Current By-Law:

By-Laws, Rules, and Regulations of the University Senate, II.B.12, Readmission

12. Readmission

A student seeking readmission to the University must apply through the Dean of Students Office. Readmission is not guaranteed. Criteria used in determining readmission include, but are not limited to, academic progress, university discipline history, and criminal history. All applications for readmission must be evaluated through the Dean of Students Office who will convene a readmission board including the deans' designees. The standards for academic evaluation can be found at the website of each school/college, the Dean of Students Office and the Regional Campus Student Service Offices. The attention of such students is called to the following University regulations:

1. A student who wishes to apply toward a degree credits earned more than eight years before graduation must obtain permission from the dean of the school or college concerned and the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.
2. All readmitted students (except those who are on an official leave of absence returning to their previous school or college) must satisfy the academic requirements of the school or college to which readmitted as stated in the catalog effective at the time of readmission, unless a subsequent catalog is elected. (9/6/2013)

Proposed By-Law:

By-Laws, Rules, and Regulations of the University Senate, II.B.12, Readmission

13. *Readmission*

A student seeking readmission to the University must apply through the Dean of Students Office. Readmission is not guaranteed. Criteria used in determining readmission include, but are not limited to, academic progress, university discipline history, and criminal history. All applications for readmission must be evaluated through the Dean of Students Office who will convene a readmission board including the deans' designees. The standards for academic evaluation can be found at the website of each school/college, the Dean of Students Office and the Regional Campus Student Service Offices. The attention of such students is called to the following University regulations:

1. A student who wishes to apply toward a degree credits earned more than eight years before graduation must obtain permission from the dean of the school or college concerned and the Vice Provost for Academic Affairs.
2. All readmitted students (except those who are on an official leave of absence returning to their previous school or college) must satisfy the academic requirements of the school or college to which readmitted as stated in the catalog effective at the time of readmission, unless a subsequent catalog is elected.
3. Undergraduate students who have been separated from the university for at least eight consecutive semesters may seek academic renewal at the time of their application for readmission. Through academic renewal, a student may remove up to 16 credits of coursework with a grade of C- or lower from their GPA calculation after rematriculating at UConn. These courses must have been taken previously at the University of Connecticut. The registered grade, earned credits, and grade points for these courses shall remain on the transcript but will no longer calculate into the GPA. Students shall not receive credit toward their degree for courses placed on academic renewal. Academic renewal can be used only once and is limited to those completing their first bachelor's degree at UConn.

**Scholastic Standards Committee
To the University Senate
Present: 2.6.2023 & Vote: 3.6.2023**

Background:

In 2021, the Senate Executive Committee requested that the Provost's Office establish a working group to examine policies regarding Academic Misconduct/Integrity. A university-wide task force, led by Vice Provost Gladis Kersaint, was established and charged with:

- Reviewing, advising, and making recommendations regarding the university's strategic approach to addressing academic integrity standards.
- Reviewing relevant institutional policies, procedures, and practices to ensure institutional congruence and participant fairness; and
- Communicating with respective constituents to solicit insights and provide committee updates.
- Proposing recommendations related to Academic Integrity, including procedures for addressing identified misconduct.
- Making recommendation about needed student, faculty, and staff development.

The following were among the identified issues by the AI Task Force:

- Academic Integrity and related challenges have been discussed over the years, yet little attention has been given to the recommended approaches for improvement.
- Lack of an institution-wide approach, messaging, and professional development related to Academic, Scholarly, and Professional Integrity (APSI) for both faculty and students
- Different policies, processes, and procedures are used for undergraduate and graduate students - APSI is boundary crossing.
- Existing policies are ambiguously defined and create institutional procedural fairness risk
- There is a lack of knowledge about and adherence to existing policies and procedures.
- There is a lack of accurate institutional data about Student Academic Misconduct (e.g., lack of records of students who may have multiple violations, lack of information about the types of violation to support developmental programming, etc.)
- Lack of information about appropriate sanctions for student misconduct

The following goal were established by the AI Task Force:

- To develop a comprehensive and university-wide approach for academic, scholarly, and professional integrity (ASPI), including one point of access for information for faculty and students (i.e., ASPI website)
- To update policies, processes, and procedures and recommend all suggested changes for approval to the appropriate bodies, including University Senate, Graduate Faculty Council.
- *“Develop and publicize, clear, fair, academic integrity policies, procedures, and statements that can be effectively understood, procedurally sound, and consistently implemented” – International Center for Academic Integrity (2021), p. 11*

Current By-Law:

By-Laws, Rules, and Regulations of the University Senate, II.D.11, Cheating- Student Academic Misconduct

11. *Cheating - Student Academic Misconduct*

Academic misconduct is dishonest or unethical academic behavior that includes but is not limited to misrepresenting mastery in an academic area (e.g., cheating), failing to properly credit information, research or ideas to their rightful originators or representing such information, research or ideas as your own (e.g., plagiarism).

Instructors shall take reasonable steps to prevent academic misconduct in their courses and to inform students of course-specific requirements. Students' responsibilities with respect to academic integrity are described "Responsibilities of Community Life: The Student Code."

When the instructor of record or designee (hereafter referred to as instructor) believes that an act of academic misconduct has occurred he or she is responsible for saving the evidence in its original form and need not return any of the original papers or other materials to the student. Copies of the student's work and information about other evidence will be provided to the student upon request.

When an instructor believes there is sufficient information to demonstrate a case of academic misconduct, he or she shall notify the student in writing of the allegation of misconduct and the academic consequences that the instructor will impose. The appropriate academic consequence for serious offenses is generally considered to be failure in the course. For offenses regarding small portions of the course work, failure for that portion is suggested with the requirement that the student repeat the work for no credit. The written notification shall also inform the student whether the case has been referred to the Academic Integrity Hearing Board (Board) for consideration of additional sanctions. The instructor shall send the written notification to the student with a copy to the Office of Community Standards within five business days of having discovered the alleged misconduct. At the Regional Campuses, a copy shall be sent to the Office of Student Affairs (Regional Campus Student Affairs). Cases that are purely technical in nature, without any perceived intent to achieve academic advantage, may be reported at the discretion of the instructor.

In certain cases, the dean of a school or college or designee may become aware of alleged academic misconduct and may bring a complaint forward to the Academic Misconduct Hearing Board.

The student has five business days from receipt of the written notice to respond to the instructor and/or to request a hearing (see Academic Integrity Hearing Board). If the student does not respond within the allotted time the instructor's sanctions shall be imposed. If the student requests a hearing the instructor shall forward the request to the Office of Community Standards. At the Regional Campuses, the instructor shall forward a copy to the Office of Student Affairs. If the student and the instructor reach a mutually acceptable resolution of the case the instructor shall notify the Office of Community Standards (or the Regional Campus Office of Student Affairs) of the agreement. The instructor shall also notify the Office of Community Standards (or the Regional Campus Office of Student Affairs) if he or she withdraws

the allegation of misconduct. A student who has been notified that he or she has been accused of academic misconduct may not withdraw from the course in which the alleged misconduct has occurred without the approval of the instructor and the appropriate dean. If a student withdraws from a course during a pending academic misconduct case, any academic sanction imposed will overturn the withdrawal.

If a semester concludes before an academic misconduct matter is resolved, the student shall receive a temporary 'I' (incomplete) grade in the course until the instructor submits the appropriate grade.

The Academic Integrity Hearing Board

The Academic Integrity Hearing Board, which is administered by the Office of Community Standards (Dean of Students Office), comprises two faculty members, two students, and a nonvoting chairperson, all of whom are appointed by the Director of the Office of Community Standards. At each Regional Campus, a designee working in conjunction with the Office of Community Standards is responsible for the organization and administration of their Academic Integrity Hearing Board. Hearing procedures will be in accordance with the hearing procedures described in "The Student Code." The Office of Community Standards will ensure that appropriate Dean(s) and Faculty are kept informed of the status of misconduct cases in a timely fashion.

The accused student or the accusing instructor may refer a case of alleged academic misconduct to the Office of Community Standards for it to be adjudicated by the Academic Misconduct Hearing Board. Community Standards will review all academic misconduct cases as they are received to determine if a case needs to be heard by the Board to determine if additional sanctions need to be considered. After receiving written notification of academic misconduct from the instructor, Community Standards may meet with students to discuss additional sanctions outlined in *The Student Code* to determine if an agreement about additional sanctions can be reached. If an agreement cannot be reached between a student and Community Standards, the case will be heard by the Board.

Hearing on Academic Misconduct

If the Board finds that the student is "Not Responsible" for the alleged misconduct the Board shall not impose any sanctions and the instructor must reevaluate the student's course grade in light of the Board's finding.

If the Academic Misconduct Hearing Board finds that the student is "Responsible", the instructor's grading sanction shall be imposed. The Board does not have the authority to change or influence the grading sanction imposed by the instructor.

Upon consideration of a student's record of misconduct and/or the nature of the offense the Board may impose additional sanctions. The Board should apply these sanctions in proportion to the severity of the misconduct. These sanctions may include any sanctions as described in *The Student Code*.

Hearing Appeal

The decision of the Academic Misconduct Hearing Board may be appealed to the Provost or his/her designee. An appeal is not a new hearing. It is a review of the record of the original hearing.

1. An appeal may be sought on three grounds:

- a. On a claim of error in the hearing procedure that substantially affected the decision.
- b. On a claim of new evidence or information material to the case that was not known at the time of the hearing.
- c. To determine whether any additional sanction(s) (not including academic consequences) imposed by the Board were appropriate for the violation of *The Student Code* based in the student's conduct history and/or significance of the violation.

2. Appeals on such grounds may be presented, specifically described, in writing within five business days of the announcement of the Board's decision.

3. The decision of the Provost or his/her designee is final. There will be no further right of appeal.

4. The Provost or his/her designee shall have the authority to dismiss an appeal not sought on proper grounds.

If an appeal is upheld, the Provost shall refer the case with procedural specifications back to the original Hearing Body who shall reconsider the case accordingly.

Proposed By-Law:

Motion to Remove all current language from the By-Laws, Rules, and Regulations of the University Senate, II.D.11, Cheating- Student Academic Misconduct and replace with:

Issues related to academic and scholarly integrity at the University of Connecticut are governed by the Academic, Scholarly, and Professional Integrity and Misconduct Policy. This policy, together with procedures for implementing it, were developed by a committee including representatives from the University Senate and Graduate Faculty Council, as well as professional staff from the divisions tasked with administering the policy (Community Standards and The Graduate School). To recommend changes to the policy or to the implementing procedures, a committee must be convened by the Office of Academic and Scholarly Integrity that brings together all the above relevant stakeholders, including University Senate and Graduate Faculty Council. The committee must then bring those changes to the University Senate and Graduate Faculty Council, and each body must vote to approve any changes before they can be recommended to the President's Cabinet or implemented.

Title:	Academic, Scholarly, and Professional Integrity and Misconduct (Policy on)
Policy Owner:	Division of Student Affairs Provost Office
Applies to:	All members of the University community
Campus Applicability:	UConn Storrs and Regional Campuses
Effective Date:	July 1, 2022
For More Information, Contact	Director or Associate Director, Office of Community Standards (community@uconn.edu) or Director of Graduate Student and Postdoctoral Scholar Support, The Graduate School (gradschool@uconn.edu)
Official Website	policy.uconn.edu

Commented [KG1]: Notes:

1. The policy was developed using the revised [University Policy and Protocol Template](#).
2. The intent is for this policy and its related procedure to replace and decommission the following policies.
 - a. [Academic Integrity in Undergraduate Education and Research](#)
 - b. [Graduate School Scholarly Integrity and Misconduct Policy](#)
 - c. [Student Discipline, Dismissal and Appeal Process from Professional/Clinical Programs \(Procedures on\)](#)

In addition, the [Policy on Alleged Misconduct in Research](#) has been updated using the revised policy template (i.e., recast as *Policy Research Integrity and Misconduct & Procedures for the Violation of the Research Integrity and Misconduct Policy*) which represents a non-technical, nonsubstantive change.

BACKGROUND

The University of Connecticut is committed to fostering an intellectual community in which the highest ethical standards of academic, scholarly, and professional integrity prevail. All members of the university community, including administrators, faculty, staff, and students, have a shared responsibility to uphold this commitment. This commitment relates to all aspects of academic, scholarly, and professional activity, which include not only activities related to instruction, but also those related to the production and dissemination of scholarship, research, and creative works, and to professional conduct within clinical and other professional settings. Integrity in all of these activities is of paramount importance, and the University requires that the highest ethical standards in teaching, learning, research, and service be maintained. This includes “ethical aspects of scholarship that influence the next generation of researchers as teachers, mentors, supervisors, and successful stewards of grant funds” (Council of Graduate Schools, 2012).

Issues related to academic and scholarly integrity at the University of Connecticut are governed by the Academic, Scholarly, and Professional Integrity and Misconduct Policy (DATE). This policy, together with procedures for implementing it, were developed by a committee including representatives from the University Senate and Graduate Faculty Council, as well as professional staff from the divisions tasked with administering the policy (Community Standards and The Graduate School). To recommend changes to the policy or to the implementing procedures, a committee must be convened that brings together all the above relevant stakeholders, including University Senate and Graduate Faculty Council. The committee must then bring those changes to the University Senate and Graduate Faculty Council, and each body must vote to approve any changes before they can be recommended to the President’s Cabinet or implemented.

Students' responsibilities with respect to academic and scholarly integrity are described in the following documents: [Responsibility of Community Life: The Student Code](#).

PURPOSE

To ensure a commitment to academic, scholarly, and professional integrity in all levels of the university community.

Such a commitment ensures that:

- all individuals accept full responsibility for their own work and ideas;
- all academic/scholarly credit awarded to an individual represents the work of that individual;
- no student benefits from an unfair advantage;
- faculty, staff, advisors and others who support the intellectual development of students are committed to fostering, guiding, and monitoring students for adherence to all principles of academic and scholarly integrity;
- the grades earned, the degrees or certificate conferred were appropriately earned by the individual;
- the reputation of the University with respect to academic and scholarly integrity are protected
- faculty, staff, and students adhere to the professional standards of conduct specific to each program offered at the university;
- this policy is used consistently across the University, including undergraduate and graduating students and schools/colleges.

APPLIES TO

This policy applies to all members of the University Community engaged in academic and scholarly efforts in, but is not limited to, the following contexts in undergraduate and graduate education:

- courses, including online courses (e.g., assignments, exams, projects, thesis);
- experiential and service-learning courses and activities;
- study abroad programs;
- clinical and practice placements, internships, and externships;
- program assessments (e.g., comprehensive exams, thesis, program reviews);
- research, including undergraduate, graduate, postdoctoral scholar, and faculty research; ~~and~~
- processes involving submitting information (i.e., admissions, for scholarships/fellowships, for competitions, for awards, or other university programs); and
- professional events and conferences

All members of the University community are responsible for ensuring that the principles of academic and scholarly integrity are upheld.

This policy applies to graduate students and postdoctoral scholars, with the exception of students with degrees conferred by the Schools of Dental Medicine, Medicine, or Law.

This policy does not apply to legal, regulatory, or compliance requirements that fall outside the Academic and Scholarly Integrity Policy. In addition, this policy does not remove any reporting requirements to the appropriate oversight authority in instances of noncompliance or alleged noncompliance.

DEFINITIONS

Academic Integrity: a commitment by the University Community to uphold just and ethical behaviors, which includes truthfulness, fairness, and respect (ICAI, 2021).

Scholarly Integrity: a commitment by the University community to both "... research integrity and the ethical understanding and skill required of researchers/scholars in domestic, international, and multicultural contexts. It is also intended to address ethical aspects of scholarship that influence the next generation of researchers as teachers, mentors, supervisors, and successful stewards of grant funds." (p. xix, Council of Graduate Schools, 2012).

Professional Integrity. Standards of behavior defined by the various professions in which students are prepared through their degree or certificate programs.

Academic, Scholarly, and Professional Integrity Misconduct is defined as unethical academic and scholarly behavior during a course (e.g., on an assignment or exam), as part of other degree requirements (e.g., requirements regarding placement, capstone or comprehensive exams, or placement exams), or at other times during undergraduate, graduate, or professional study and performance, including during engagement in fieldwork, clinical placements, or research. These behaviors include:

- **Cheating:** Unauthorized acts, actions, or behaviors in academic or scholarly areas. Examples of cheating include, but are not limited to:
 - providing or receiving help on an assignment or exam intended to reflect the individual student's work product when not authorized to do so by the instructor.
 - buying, selling, circulating, or using a copy of instructional materials, assignment or test, including uploading such information to online services, or using materials prepared by services that sell or provide papers or other course materials.
 - asking someone to complete an assignment, exam, or other requirement on ~~your~~ ones behalf or completing an assignment, exam, or requirement for another student.
 - Failure to disclose unauthorized assistance on work submitted for evaluation, i.e., assistance obtained outside channels approved by instructors, that is used to complete a course, program, or degree requirement. This includes assistance from other students, teaching assistants, Quantitative Learning Center, Writing Center, or mediated support from the Center for Students with Disabilities.
- **Plagiarizing:** Using one's own previously published, presented, or disseminated material, or another person's language/text, data, ideas, expressions, digital/graphic element, passages of music, mathematical proofs, scientific data, code, or other original material without authorization of the originating source or proper acknowledgement, attribution, or citation of the originating source. Examples of plagiarism include but are not limited to:
 - submitting as one's own any work (in whole or part) completed by another individual, including any work that has been purchased from an individual, commercial research firm, or obtained from the internet.
 - submitting for evaluation or credit any work that was previously used or submitted for credit in another course or as part of a degree requirement (e.g., a thesis or dissertation) without authorization to do so from the instructor. (This includes self-plagiarism in the form of re-using, in part or whole, the content of a paper from another class or context.).

- submitting any work prepared for or used in a previous publication, academic competition, clinic, or other activity (e.g., grant or application submission) without prior approval and full disclosure or when permitted by established editorial or other policy. (This includes self-plagiarism in the form of using, in part or whole, the content of a paper that was previously published without attribution).
- unauthorized use of previously completed work or research for a thesis, dissertation, or publication.
- **Misrepresenting:** Deliberately knowing and providing false or misleading information, including information about oneself or others. Examples of misrepresenting include but are not limited to:
 - engaging in “any omission or misrepresentation of the information necessary and sufficient to evaluate the validity and significance of research, at the level appropriate to the context in which the research is communicated” (D. Fanelli, *Nature* 494:149; 2013).
 - making unauthorized alterations to any document or digital file pertaining to academic or scholarly activity, including assignments, exams, and research data.
 - making up information for the purpose of deception (e.g., fabrication of data in research).
 - making false, inaccurate, or misleading claims or statements, including claims/statements made when asking for assistance (e.g., requesting an extension on an assignment), applying for admission to an undergraduate or graduate program, applying for a scholarship or an academic, scholarly, or research award, or submitting manuscripts for publications.
 - allowing someone to use one’s identity or using someone else’s identity for academic or scholarly advantage (e.g., signing in electronically for an absent student).
 - accepting credit for work for which the individual did not contribute (e.g., misrepresenting an individual’s role in a group assignments).
- **Noncompliance:** Failure to conform with codified and publicly available academic, scholarly, or professional standards, processes, or protocols. Examples of noncompliance include but are not limited to:
 - not attending to the professional standards governing the professional conduct of students in particular fields (e.g., pharmacy, nursing, education, counseling, and therapy).
 - violating protocols governing the use of human or animal subjects.
 - breaching confidentiality in academic and scholarly activity (e.g., disclosing the identity of study participants).
 - disregarding the applicable university, local, state, or federal regulations that guide academic or scholarly activities.

Instructor: any faculty, teaching assistant, or any other person (e.g., lab supervisor, clinical supervisor, professional staff) authorized by the University to provide educational services (e.g., teaching, research, advising)

Commented [KG2]: This terminology is from the Student Code. We are using it to maintain consistency across university policy statements

POLICY STATEMENT

All members of the university community, including administrators, faculty, staff, and students, have a shared responsibility to uphold the highest ethical standards of academic, scholarly, and professional integrity and to report any violations of those standards of which they are aware.

Instructor Expectations: To foster a culture of academic integrity, instructors are responsible for communicating the expectations for academic and scholarly integrity to students and for engaging in practices that mitigate violations of this policy. Specifically, instructors are expected to:

- include a link to the *Academic, Scholarly, and Professional Integrity and Misconduct* policy as part of course syllabi or documentation for any other academic/scholarly activity and include any additional unit-specific expectations.
- review academic and scholarly integrity policy and any other disciplinary- or activity-specific expectations.
- provide clear guidance for all assignments, activities, and assessments, including noting what resources can be used and whether collaboration is permitted.
- ensure individuals engaged in research, creative, or professional activities understand the standards, protocols, and guidelines to which they must adhere.
- adhere to the University processes for reporting misconduct, engaging in the review process, and assigning consequences to address violations, which should include opportunities for education and remediation.

Student Expectations: To uphold the principle of academic and scholarly integrity in all aspects of their intellectual development and engagement at the University, students are expected to:

- be responsible for their own work and their own actions related to all academic and scholarly endeavors.
- assume they are to do independent work and seek clarification prior to collaborating with others or using outside resources.
- understand and abide by the standards, protocols, and guidelines to which they must adhere in research, creative, or professional activities .

If students witness or become aware of a violation of academic or scholarly integrity, they are encouraged to communicate this to the appropriate university representative (e.g., faculty, staff, advisor).

A cumulative record is maintained of all academic or scholarly integrity violations and such record will be reviewed and considered as part of subsequent incidences. Individuals engaged in research are expected to follow all standards, rules and regulations that guide the proper conduct of research or creative activity.

ENFORCEMENT

Violations of this policy and its related procedures may result in appropriate disciplinary measures in accordance with University By-Laws, General Rules of Conduct for All University Employees, applicable collective bargaining agreements, and the University of Connecticut Student Code.

Notes: Student misconduct is governed by the University's [Student Code](#), which is administered under the direction of the Division of Student Affairs. Enforcement of its provisions is the responsibility of the Director of Community Standards (for undergraduate students), The Graduate School (for graduate students), and the Office of the Vice President for Research (for research misconduct). At the Health Center, student misconduct other than academic and scholarly misconduct is governed by the Health Center [Code of Conduct](#). Identified misconduct will be routed to the appropriate unit.

Faculty misconduct is also governed by the [State Code of Ethics](#) and misconduct is addressed by the appropriate university administrative unit(s) (e.g., School/College, Provost Office, Office of the Vice President of Research, Human Resources).

REFERENCES

International Center for Academic Integrity [ICAI]. (2021). The Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity. (3rd ed.)

https://academicintegrity.org/images/pdfs/20019_ICAI-Fundamental-Values_R12.pdf

Council of Graduate Education (2012). Research and Scholarly Integrity in Graduate Education: A Comprehensive Approach. <https://cgsnet.org/research-and-scholarly-integrity-graduate-education-comprehensive-approach-2>

[Responsibilities of Community Life: The Student Code](#)

Policy on Research Integrity and Misconduct

PROCEDURES/FORMS

Academic and Scholarly Integrity Form

Procedures for Addressing Alleged Violations of the Policy on Academic or Scholarly Integrity

Procedures for Addressing Alleged Misconduct in Research

POLICY HISTORY

- Approved: XX/XX/XXXX (Approved by University Senate)
10/26/2022 (Approved by Graduate Faculty Council)
XX/XX/2022 (University Senior Policy Council)

Commented [KG3]: Although aspects of research integrity is addressed as part of the ASI Policy, due to regulatory requirement UConn must also have a separate *Research Integrity and Misconduct* Policy. The procedures that govern specific misconduct will depend on the nature of the misconduct. Professional administrators will discuss issues across units to ensure issues are routed through the appropriate unit (e.g., research misconduct as part of the development learning process vs. research misconduct related to an externally funded research project).

Commented [KG4]: Links to the following documents will be included.

Title:	Procedures for Addressing Alleged Violations of the Policy on Academic, Scholarly, and Professional Integrity
Procedure Owner:	Provost Office
Applies to:	Undergraduate and Graduate Students
Campus Applicability:	UConn Storrs and Regional Campuses
Effective Date:	DATE (Proposed Aug 2023)
For More Information, Contact	Director, Office of Academic and Scholarly Integrity
Official Website	provost.uconn.edu

PURPOSE

To outline the procedures for addressing academic or scholarly misconduct as described in the Policy on Academic, Scholarly, and Professional Integrity and Misconduct.

APPLIES TO

This policy applies to all members of the University Community engaged in academic, scholarly, and professional activity in undergraduate and graduate education as outlined in the Policy on Academic, Scholarly, and Professional Integrity. These procedures apply to graduate students and postdoctoral scholars, except for those in the Schools of Dental Medicine, Medicine, or Law. The procedure outlined by those Schools must be followed. However, it does apply to graduate students enrolled in UConn Health programs that come under the jurisdiction of The Graduate Schools (e.g., MPH, Ph.D. programs) The procedures outlined below do not apply to Research Misconduct, which is address in the Policy on Research Integrity. The procedures for addressing research misconduct must be followed.

Cases involving an alleged violation of standards governing the professional codes of conduct for students in professional fields (e.g., pharmacy, nursing, education, counseling, and therapy) or research may be subject to additional review by other entities inside or outside the University (e.g., professional organizations or credentialing boards, research misconduct review boards as noted in the Research Integrity Policy).

DEFINITIONS

Academic Consequences: means consequences imposed by an instructor, a program, or the Academic and Scholarly Integrity Hearing Panel resulting from violations of the Academic or Scholarly Integrity policy during a course (e.g., assignment, exam), as part of degree requirements (e.g., placement, capstone or comprehensive exam, placement exams), or at other times during undergraduate, graduate, or professional study and performance, including during engagement in fieldwork, clinical placements, or research. Examples of academic consequences include but are not limited to receiving a lowered grade on an assignment, exam, or course; repeating an assignment, course, or programmatic experience; or engaging in additional educative experiences.

Commented [KG1]: Notes: This document references an Office of Academic and Scholarly Integrity, which will be developed as part of the Provost Office, pending the approval of the new policy and procedures.

Currently, these hearing are facilitated by Community Standards and the Graduate School

Commented [KG2R1]: The Director of the Office of Academic and Scholarly Integrity will report to the Vice Provost of Academic Affairs

Commented [KG3]: Will include a hyperlink to the policy statement

Commented [KG4]: To ensure consistency across policy statements and to the extent possible, we used verbatim definitions as used in other existing policy documents (e.g., student code). However, we edited some to add clarity.

Academic and Scholarly Integrity Hearing Panel (Hearing Panel): means the group of University representatives who are authorized to conduct a hearing to determine the appropriate resolution of an alleged violation of the *Policy on Academic and Scholarly Integrity*, and/or to impose academic consequences or affect other remedies as appropriate.

Commented [KG5]: We are using the term Hearing Panel, instead of Hearing Board to be consistent with its use by other units (e.g., OIE)

Evidence – means any document, tangible item, or testimony offered or obtained during a misconduct hearing that is intended to prove or disprove the existence of an alleged fact.

Hearing Chair: means the individual who presides over the hearing to ensure that 1) the hearing procedures are followed and 2) no party threatens, intimidates, or coerces any of the participants.

Instructor: means any faculty member, teaching assistant, or any other person authorized by the University to provide educational services (e.g., teaching, research, or academic advising).

Preponderance of Evidence: The standard of evidence used by the Hearing Panel is “preponderance of evidence.” Preponderance of evidence means that the action/event was more likely to have occurred than not. Students may be found responsible on the bases of direct evidence (e.g., a behavior observed by an instructor, such as cheating during an in-person exam), circumstantial evidence, or a combination of the two. Examples include but are not limited to any of the following: a dramatic change in writing style; possession of accessible notes, devices (i.e., mobile phone, calculators, etc.) or similarly prohibited materials during an exam; observed communication between students during an exam; or unusual similarity among exams, papers, assignments, projects, or other work, including similarity with online resources.

Reporting party: means any person who submits an allegation that a student violated *the Academic and Scholarly Integrity Policy*. If the reporting party is not an instructor, the issue will be referred to an appropriate instructor, who will facilitate this process.

Sanctions: means a consequences that may be imposed, individually or in various combinations by the University, on any student found to have violated the [Student Code](#), including the *Academic and Scholarly Integrity Policy*. Sanctions include, but are not limited to warning, probation, suspension, or expulsion (see Section E of the Student Code for more information). Sanctions are administered by Community Standards and designees only, and are separate from academic consequences imposed by an instructor or a program.

Student: means any person admitted, registered, enrolled, or attending any University course or University program; any person admitted to the University who is on University premises or University-related premises for any purpose pertaining to the person’s registration or enrollment. For purposes of *The Student Code’s* jurisdiction, which includes Academic and Scholarly Integrity, the Director of Community Standards will make any final determination as to whether an individual is a student.

Support person: means any person who accompanies a student or instructor for the limited purpose of providing support and guidance. A support person may not directly address the Hearing Panel, question witnesses, or otherwise actively participate in the hearing process.

Witness: means any individual who has direct knowledge of an incident. Character witnesses are not part of the student misconduct process. Witnesses cannot serve as support persons.

PROCEDURES

I. Initial Conversation (between Instructor and Student(s))

If an instructor believes that a student has violated the Academic, Scholarly, and Professional Integrity and Misconduct Policy, the instructor is expected to have an initial conversation with the student (i.e., in person, virtually, or by email correspondences sent to a student's university email address (i.e., name@uconn.edu) regarding the suspected or apparent violation to determine if any additional information is available that might be relevant to the determination of whether a violation has actually occurred and what might be an appropriate consequence. This initial conversation should take place as soon as practical after the alleged violation has come to the attention of the instructor (typically within one week). The instructor shall present the student with the apparent or suspected allegation and provide the student with an opportunity to respond and present evidence refuting the allegation if they wish.

Based on all available information, the instructor may find that the student is either:

- "not in violation" of the Academic, Scholarly, and Professional Integrity and Misconduct Policy. In such cases, no additional action is necessary, or
- "in violation" of the Academic, Scholarly, and Professional Integrity and Misconduct Policy.

When an instructor finds that a student is "in violation" of the Academic and Scholarly Integrity policy and intends to impose an academic consequence for the violation the instructor must follow the steps outlined below to ensure that the student's due process rights are not violated.

1. The instructor must report this action, the nature of the violation, and the proposed academic consequence in writing using the **Academic and Scholarly Misconduct Report Form**. A copy of this report, which will document the allegations and intended consequences, will be sent to the student via their official University email address. The email will also include instructions for seeking additional guidance through an Informational Meeting (described below) and the process to contest the findings, including specific deadlines to which they must adhere (also described below).
2. When the allegation occurs in the context of a course, the instructor may also bring the case directly to the Academic and Scholarly Integrity Hearing Panel if they believe a failing grade, the most severe academic consequence that the course instructor can impose, is too lenient given the nature of the offense.

Upon receiving official notification of an alleged violation, a student may contest the finding and/or the intended consequence(s) using the procedures outlined below. If the student contests the finding(s) and/or the intended consequence(s), the consequence(s) may not be formally applied until the process regarding the contestation has been completed.

If a finding of "in violation" is not contested by the given deadline, the notification will be considered a finding of responsibility for violating the Academic and Scholarly Integrity policy and the intended academic consequence will be applied.

II. Informational Meeting

Commented [KG6]: Note: Moving forward the intent is to use one form for Academic and Scholarly Integrity, which will be included in the newly developed Academic and Scholarly Integrity Website that will include policy, procedures, and other educative materials. The forms currently in use are found below using the Maxient software:

- Undergraduate:
https://cm.maxient.com/reportingform.php?UnivofConnecticut&layout_id=4
- Graduate:
https://cm.maxient.com/reportingform.php?UnivofConnecticut&layout_id=22

We can revise the final form to be used once the policy and procedures are approved.

When an instructor notifies a student that they are in violation, the student and/or the instructor may request an informational meeting with a representative from the Office of Academic and Scholarly Integrity. These meetings provide an opportunity to obtain additional information and guidance about the Academic, Scholarly, and Professional Integrity and Misconduct Policy and student misconduct procedures. These informational meetings provide impartial information and guidance only and do not provide advice about a course of action that should be taken by either the instructor or the student.

Guidance may be provided about the following:

- the *Policy on Academic, Scholarly, and Professional Integrity and Misconduct* and/or other policy set in School/College documents (e.g., syllabi, program handbook, school/college policies)
- the *Procedures for Addressing Student Violations of the Academic, Scholarly, and Professional Integrity and Misconduct*
- instructor and student rights and responsibilities, including implications of multiple findings of “in violation”
- information about consequences that may be levied, including academic and programmatic consequences and university sanctions.
- educative information or where additional information can be found about academic, scholarly, and professional integrity (e.g., library resources about plagiarism)

Students are encouraged to take advantage of an informational meeting to seek additional insights and obtain answers to questions prior to deciding whether to contest the finding(s) of the instructor and/or the intended consequence(s).

Note: The individual providing the guidance cannot be part of a subsequent hearing process.

III. Academic and Scholarly Integrity Hearing Panel Process

A student found “in violation” by an instructor may contest the finding(s) and/or the intended academic consequences. If the alleged violation involves a course and a grade for the student in the course must be submitted before the case can be decided, the faculty member shall record a grade of incomplete (I), pending a decision by the Hearing Panel or a final appeal.

- A. All contestations must be submitted in writing through the *Scholarly Misconduct Report Form* no later than two weeks (i.e., 10 business days) after notification of the *in violation* finding. Upon receiving a student’s request to contest the finding(s) and/or intended consequences, the instructor will be notified and the merits of the contestation will be reviewed by a Hearing Chair.
 - An exception to the 10-day deadline may be granted at the discretion of the Hearing Chair on a showing of good cause.
- B. Students who contest an allegation for a course that is in progress should continue attending the class and complete coursework.
- C. A contestation’s merits will be reviewed by a Hearing Chair to determine if it should proceed to a Hearing Panel. Contestations found to have merit are moved to the Hearing Panel process.
 - Lack of intentionality is not an acceptable basis to contest. Academic consequences cannot be contested in cases where the penalty(ies) are explicitly stated in the course syllabus and/or fall within standard recommendations set by the University.If the Hearing Chair decides not to convene a Hearing Committee because the case does not have merit, a rationale will be provided and the decision cannot be appealed.
- D. The Hearing Panel may conclude that a student is:

Commented [KG7]: A process is “a high-level overview that provides a roadmap for how a task will be accomplished)

- *in violation of the Academic, Scholarly, and Professional Integrity and Misconduct* and determine that the student will receive consequences as described below. These consequences may differ from the consequences recommended by the instructor.
 - *not in violation of the Academic, Scholarly, and Professional Integrity and Misconduct* and determine that the student will not be subject to the consequence determined by the instructor (i.e., they will earn the grade or credit received for the assignment, experience, or course).
- E. A student found *in-violation* of the *Academic, Scholarly, and Professional Integrity and Misconduct* or the instructor may contest the Hearing Panel’s decision by submitting a final appeal (see section IV).

Note: A student who is found *in-violation* of the academic and scholarly integrity policy and is determined to have presented false evidence or false statements at the hearing may have a second violation brought against them by the Hearing Panel. This would constitute multiple violations and potentially more serious penalties, including status consequences, which may include suspension or permanent expulsion.

IV. Composition of the Academic and Scholarly Integrity Committee and Hearing Panels

A. *Academic and Scholarly Integrity Committee*

The Academic and Scholarly Integrity Committee is a standing committee of the Provost Office.

- Charge: This committee will be charged with the following:
 - Participate in annual training to be eligible to serve as Hearing Chairs and members of Academic and Scholarly Integrity Hearing Panels
 - Serve on Academic and Scholarly Integrity Hearing Panels
 - Represent their school/college on all issues related to academic and scholarly integrity.
 - Make recommendations to sustain a culture of Academic and Scholarly Integrity at UConn.
 - Review the Academic and Scholarly Integrity information (e.g., relevant policies, processes, and procedures, relevant systemic and structural processes, educative material, and annual reports).
 - Advise on needed programming (e.g., Academic and Scholarly Integrity Awareness Week) or educational materials
- Members:
 - Co-Chairs
 - Vice Provost and Dean of The Graduate School
 - Vice Provost for Faculty, Staff, and Student Development
 - Faculty Representatives
 - With the exception of the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, each School/College governed by these procedures will select three faculty members to serve three-year staggered terms. At least two of the members must be members of the Graduate Faculty. Due to its size, the College of Liberal Arts and Sciences will elect six members to serve 3-year staggered terms. At least 4 of these members must be members of the Graduate Faculty. Schools/Colleges shall notify the Provost Office

Commented [KG8]: The Academic and Scholarly Integrity Committee will be a newly formed standing committee within the Provost Office. Having such a committee will ensure access to a pool of trained and knowledgeable candidates to serve on Hearing Panels. In addition, this groups will serve as academic unit ambassadors to maintain a culture of academic integrity at UConn.

of their new representatives for the subsequent academic year by April 1.

- Student Representatives
 - Three (3) students from each school/college. They may be elected by representatives of the study body at the Undergraduate or Graduate Level. When possible, student terms should be staggered. Otherwise, students will be appointed to serve on the Committee by the Dean or Dean's designee, annually.
- Ex Officio Members (One representative from each of the following)
 - Academic and Scholarly Integrity Office
 - Community Standards,
 - The Graduate School
 - UConn Library

Commented [KG9]: This will ensure we have a full members for the subsequent academic year before the summer. It will also allow time for follow up to obtain names of members before faculty are off contract. It will also permit us to schedule the training session.

Commented [KG10]: This will ensure that these students are trained and eligible to serve on Hearing Panels. The students need not be from the school/college of the instructor or students.

Note: To facilitate the transition to staggered elected terms, the inaugural members from each school/college will be appointed to a 1-, 2-, or 3-year term. After that, each new member of the committee will be appointed to a 3-year term. In addition, when necessary, the Dean will appoint an alternate faculty member to replace a school/college representation for a short duration (e.g., sabbatical) or the remainder of an elected representative's term (e.g., resignation from the University).

B. Academic and Scholarly Integrity Hearing Panels

The Hearing Panel will be comprised of the following:

- Hearing Chair
 - The Hearing Chair will be a non-voting representative from Academic and Scholarly Integrity Committee from a school/college not represented in the hearing. The Hearing Officer will only vote in cases of a tie.
 - The Hearing Chair presides over the hearing to ensure that 1) the hearing procedures are followed, and 2) no party threatens, intimidates, or coerces any of the participants. They also keep clear and complete records of the proceedings and submit the Panel's findings and a report of the proceedings.
- Two (2) faculty representatives from the Academic and Scholarly Integrity Committee.
 - For cases involving graduate students, these faculty members must be Graduate Faculty members.
 - If the infraction occurs during the summer session, the faculty representatives will be appointed by the Dean of the school/college where the incident occurred.
- Two (2) student representatives from the Academic and Scholarly Integrity Committee
 - For cases involving graduate students, the members must be graduate student members.

Commented [KG11]: As with current practice, the faculty and student representatives need not be from the school/college of the instructor or student

No member of the Hearing Panel may be a member of the program/department of either party to the hearing, nor may any Hearing Panel member have personal or professional associations with the parties.

C. Jurisdiction

The Hearing Panel shall hear all cases that come before it *de novo*. In addition, as part of the hearing process, the Hearing Panel will consider all academic and scholarly integrity standards set in policy by the school/college or program (e.g., syllabi, program handbooks). The student shall have the right to present their case and to challenge the allegations or the evidence. While the Hearing Panel may recommend an increase in the intended consequence proposed by the instructor, it should consider raising the consequence only in the exceptional case, particularly when it is the student seeking the review.

V. Academic and Scholarly Integrity Hearing Panel Procedures

The Academic and Scholarly Integrity Hearing Panel shall convene as soon as practical after notification of a student contestation. Usually, a hearing will be conducted within fifteen (15) business days of the student being notified of the hearing. The Hearing Panel shall hear from all available parties and examine all the evidence presented.

- If the alleged violation involves a course and a grade for the student in the course must be submitted before the case can be decided, the faculty member shall record a grade of incomplete, pending a decision by the Hearing Panel or a final appeal.
 - When a hearing involves more than one student, the Hearing Chair may permit the hearings concerning each student to be conducted separately or jointly.
- A. The instructor and the student shall each have the right to:
1. Be notified of all alleged violations via the University's official email address, which will provide a link to the documentation and information about the hearing process.
 2. Review any written allegation(s) and supporting documents.
 3. A reasonable period of time (e.g., at least five business days) to prepare for a hearing.
 4. Request a delay of a hearing due to extenuating circumstances. The decision to grant or deny any such request is within the discretion of the Hearing Chair.
 5. Submit a written account and/or a personal statement regarding the incident and/or any relevant evidence to be considered using the Academic and Scholarly Misconduct Report Form.
 - All documentary evidence should be clearly labeled, organized, and submitted at least 10 business days before the hearing. New evidence will be allowed at the hearing at the sole discretion of the Hearing Chair. The party seeking to introduce new evidence must provide copies of the evidence for review by the Hearing Chair. One complete copy of all submitted evidence will be maintained as part of the record.
 - Failure to provide documentation by the established deadline will not be an acceptable reason for a final appeal.
 - The decision to not present information by the student is not an admission of responsibility.
 6. Provide the names and contact information of witnesses who have direct knowledge of the incident, a brief description of the evidence each will provide, and provide a list of recommended questions for any witnesses or the involved parties.
 - This information must be provided by the date established by the Hearing Chair. Failure to provide witness information by the established deadline will not be an acceptable reason for an appeal. The Hearing Chair will make every effort to

interview those witnesses with direct knowledge as part of the Hearing Panel process; however, the witness cannot be compelled to speak with the Hearing Chair.

- The list of any witnesses must be provided to the Hearing Chair at least two business days before the hearing. The Panel may decide not to permit one or more witnesses to participate in the hearing if the information they are expected to provide is not relevant to any material issue and is deemed unnecessary or repetitive of other information already in the record.
 - The party proposing a witness is responsible for any communication with the witness regarding attendance at the hearing.
7. Be notified of the identity of witnesses who have been called to speak at the hearing or who have been asked to provide additional written information by the Panel.
 8. Be accompanied by a support person and consult their support person throughout the hearing. However, the support person is not permitted to participate in the hearing directly. (Hearings are not rescheduled based on the availability of the support persons or the witnesses).
- B. Those present at the hearing shall be:
- The student, who is entitled to bring a support person
 - The instructor, who is entitled to bring a support person
 - Approved witnesses identified by the instructor or student, including any third-party independent witness who observed the initial conversation between the instructor and the student.
 - Witnesses will be present in the hearing room only during the period in which their statement will be provided.
- C. Should the student or instructor fail to appear before the Hearing Panel, the Panel shall have full authority to proceed in their absence.
- D. The Hearing Panel members shall be present at every hearing. However, both parties may agree in writing to waive this quorum. Of those present, a simple majority shall decide the issue. The Hearing Chair shall vote only in the case of a tie vote. The Panel shall find the student *in violation* only if there is *preponderance of evidence* indicating that the student has violated the Academic and Scholarly Integrity policy.
- E. Admission of any person into the hearing room shall be at the discretion of the Hearing Chair. The Panel shall have the authority to discharge or remove any person whose presence is deemed unnecessary or obstructive to the proceedings.
- F. The hearing is not a court proceeding and will not be bound by the procedures and rules of evidence of a court of law. Therefore, formal rules of process, procedure, and/or technical rules of evidence, such as are applied in criminal or civil case, are not used in these proceedings. The hearing will occur in private and will be audio or video recorded (if held virtually).
1. The University will maintain the recording as required by Connecticut State law and it is the property of the University. Hearing participants are prohibited from making their own recordings.

2. Upon written request, an instructor or student may review the recording and make appropriate arrangements for it to be transcribed on University premises. Arrangements for a transcriber and all associated costs involved in the transcription will be the responsibility of the requesting individual(s).
- G. The Hearing Chair will conduct the hearing in accordance with the following procedures:
1. The Hearing Chair will identify the instructor and all other persons involved in the hearing.
 2. The Hearing Chair will state the issue, as set forth in the notification sent to both parties.
 3. Each party will be offered the opportunity to make brief opening statements. Each opening statement should consist of a brief summary and should not involve lengthy discussion or presentation of evidence. The instructor will present their information first.
 4. Each party will be offered an opportunity to present evidence to support their position to the Hearing Panel. Evidence shared may include written statements, personal oral statements, witness oral statements, and physical exhibits. The instructor will present their evidence first.
 - The Hearing Panel shall provide for the exclusion of irrelevant, immaterial, or unduly repetitive evidence.
 5. Witness(es) will be offered an opportunity to make statements. The Hearing Chair will determine the order in which the witnesses will provide their statements.
 6. The Hearing Panel will be offered the opportunity to question both parties and all witnesses.
 7. Both parties will have the opportunity to present a closing statement. The instructor will present their closing statement first.
 8. At the conclusion of the closing statements, the hearing will conclude and immediately following the hearing, the Hearing Panel will privately deliberate and render a decision (see further details below). The Panel's deliberations will not be recorded. The decision shall be made by majority vote.
 9. The Hearing Chair will submit the Hearing Panel's decision and rationale, and if appropriate, the consequence imposed through the *Academic and Scholarly Integrity Reporting Form* within seven (7) days of the conclusion of the hearing. The notice of the outcome will be sent to all parties via their official University email addresses, and if appropriate, by first class mail, postage paid, to the mailing address on file with the University.
 - If the Panel affirms the finding of the instructor, or if the Panel decides a different consequence is warranted, the dean of the instructor's college and the dean of the student's college shall also receive the hearing outcome letter.
 - When a graduate student is involved, a copy of the decision will be sent to the major advisor, the graduate program coordinator and/or department head, the Dean of the School/College in which the issue occurred, and the Dean of The Graduate School.
- H. The Panel may act in one or more of the following ways
1. Find the student "Not in Violation" of the Policy of Academic and Scholarly Integrity policy

- The Panel shall not impose any academic consequences and the instructor must give the student full credit for the work produced.
2. Find the student “In Violation” of the policy on Academic and Scholarly Integrity, and
- Affirm the instructor’s consequence decision, or
 - Determine the consequence that shall be applied (e.g., a failing grade for the course or some portion of it.)

In addition to the imposed academic consequence(s), the Hearing Panel may make *recommendations* for consideration as part of an administrative review process (see section VI).

- I. Unless an appeal is filed under the guidelines established below, the Dean or Dean’s Designee of the student’s college/school shall ensure that the decision of the Hearing Panel is carried out and shall notify all parties of the implementation.
- Note: Changes to grades due to a violation of the *Academic and Scholarly Integrity* policy are not subject to the grade appeal process.

VI. Appealing the Hearing Panel Decision

Either the student or the instructor may appeal the Hearing Panel’s decision. This appeal is not a new hearing. It is a review of the record of the original hearing by a Vice Provost, specifically the Vice Provost for Graduate Education for cases involving graduate students and the Vice Provost for Faculty, Staff, and Student Development in cases involving undergraduate students. If the Board’s decision involves students from more than one college or students from more than one level, the Vice Provost(s) shall consult relevant individuals to support a comprehensive review.

To prepare this appeal, the student or instructor shall have the right to review the records of the hearing, including the audio or video recording. This review of records, including the recording, is limited to preparing the appeal only. Appeals may be sought for one of the following three outcomes:

- *Appeal of a finding of “in violation”*. A student who has received a finding of “in violation” from the Panel, or whose finding of “in violation” by the instructor was upheld by the Panel, may appeal on one or both of the following grounds:
 - Additional evidence that might have affected the outcome of the hearing became available following the hearing
 - A violation of procedure by the Hearing Panel that might have influenced the outcome of the hearing.
 The relevant Vice Provost may deny the appeal or send the case back to the Hearing Panel for reconsideration with specific instructions.
- *Appeal of a finding of “not in violation”*. An instructor can appeal this finding on one or both of the following grounds:
 - Additional evidence that might have affected the outcome of the hearing became available following the hearing
 - A violation of procedure by the Hearing Panel that might have influenced the outcome of the hearing.

The relevant Vice Provost may deny the appeal or send the case back to the Hearing Panel for reconsideration.

- *Appeal of a Academic Consequence.* The student or instructor may appeal the findings of the Hearing Panel regarding penalties to determine whether any consequences imposed by the Panel were appropriate for the violation.
 - The appeal shall specify the reasons why the student or instructor believes the consequence is inappropriate.
- A. The appeal request must be submitted in writing through the *Academic and Scholarly Integrity Form*, and shall include the Hearing Packet (i.e., all information used by the Hearing Panel to make its decision), as well as the new documentation and/or evidence, including any evidence of procedural error. The appeal must be submitted within seven (7) business days of notification of the Panel's decision, but the Vice Provost may grant exceptions to this deadline on showing of good cause.
- B. After consultation with the Hearing Panel, the Vice Provost may take one of the following actions:
 1. Affirm the decision of the Hearing Panel
 2. Modify the decision of the Hearing Panel (e.g., require that the academic or programmatic consequence be reduced or decline to carry out the recommended consequence; or alternately, increase the consequence).
 3. Return the case to the Hearing Panel with instructions to guide additional deliberations.The decision of the Vice Provost is final and cannot be appealed.

VII. Records of Action

A record of the outcome of the case, including any recordings, and the nature of the violation shall be kept by Community Standards and be assessable to the Office of Academic and Scholarly Integrity. The Office of Academic and Scholarly Integrity may disclose this record to deans, associate deans, or other university administrators in furtherance of legitimate educational interests, but to no one else unless specifically directed by the student.

VIII. Administrative Review

The file of a student found to be in-violation of the Academic and Scholarly Integrity Policy may be administratively reviewed by Community Standards or The Graduate School to determine if additional sanctions are warranted.

IX. Retaliation

Consistent with the University's [Non-Retaliation Policy](#), retaliation against any persons who makes or participates in a complaint under this policy is strictly forbidden.

X. Accommodations for Students with Disabilities

By federal law, a person with a disability is any person who: 1) has a physical or mental impairment; 2) has a record of such impairment; or 3) is regarded as having such an impairment, which

substantially limits one or more major life activities such as self-care, walking, seeing, hearing, speaking, breathing, or learning.

- A. A student requesting accommodation in regard to a hearing must follow the appropriate process for requesting accommodation through the Center for Students with Disabilities. The Center for Students with Disabilities will make a determination regarding the request and notify the appropriate parties.
- B. Reasonable accommodations depend upon the nature and degree of severity of the documented disability. While the American with Disabilities Act of 1990 requires that priority consideration be given to the specific methods requested by the student, it does not imply that a particular accommodations must be granted if it is deemed not reasonable and other suitable techniques are available.

XI. Annual Reports

An annual report of violations of the Academic and Scholarly Integrity policy and outcomes will be produced and published for each academic year.

The background of the slide is a dark, grayscale image showing several raised fists, a symbol of protest or solidarity. The fists are positioned at the bottom of the frame, with the central one being the most prominent and largest. The overall tone is somber and determined.

Proposed By-Law Change to Require the Anti-Black Racism Course for All Undergraduate Students

ABR Ad Hoc Committee

Proposed By-Law Change

“Every undergraduate student at UConn
must pass the 1 credit

UNIV 3088: Special Topics: U.S. Anti-Black Racism
as part of the baccalaureate degree requirements. It is
strongly recommended that the course be completed
during the first two years of enrollment at the University.”

II. Rules and Regulations, C. Minimum Requirements for Undergraduate Degrees, insert between #2 General Education Curriculum and #3 Conferral of Degrees.

COMMUNITY DEMAND



- Student/Faculty Demand (Post-BLM, 2020)
- USG Legislation (Fall 2020)
- 15.6% of undergraduate students enrolled at UConn took the course in the first year the course was offered
- 2020 UConn Racial Microaggressions Survey
"There should be a comprehensive and mandatory online lesson, like the one for drug and alcohol that everyone should take on culture appropriation and teach what diversity actually is. Without that proper level of education, no one will speak out about the low level of inclusivity on campus."

Why ABR?

In 2020, UConn created the Anti-Black Racism to serve as the first collective opportunity for Undergraduate Students to engage with topics surrounding Anti-Racism. However, it was **never** meant to be the **only** opportunity.

The ABR Course includes modules such as, **Systemic Racism & Global Anti-Black Racism, Black Led & Intersectional Social Movements, Contemporary Intersectional Solidarity**, all intended to address Anti-Black racism in an inclusive way.

The ABR course is intended to serve as the **gateway** to discussing discrimination and racism of **all** kinds.

Course Statistics

COURSE STATISTICS

- Total Enrollment to Date: 4,769 students completed graded as S/U
- 94.3% percent completion rate

SUMMARY OF SET SURVEY DATA

The following observations hold across 9 SET surveys of 3 different ABR professors:

- Students generally spend about 1-3 hours per week on the course
- The **level of difficulty** of course content is mostly rated **“about the same as most courses”** or **“less than most courses”** across all professors
- There is an even distribution of students who rated **how much they learned** in the course between: **“about the same as most courses”**, **“more than most courses”**, and **“much more than most courses”** across most surveys
- Across all courses (excluding graduate courses), the majority of respondents were freshmen

COST STRUCTURE

Cost and Financial Aid

- **1 credit at cost structure**
- Course to be offered during the first 7 weeks of fall & spring semesters.
- Full-time status results at zero cost for students enrolled in 12+ credits (92% of our students).
- Course to be offered during summer 1 credit, 0 cost for all interested students including part-time students..

Cost to Run

- Estimate is at ~ \$50k annually funded by Provost's office
- One-credit adjunct rate for faculty lead
- Graduate student who will manage administrative tasks (email correspondence and discussion board moderation)

COURSE OVERSIGHT

CCC+ vs. UICC

- WHY UICC?
 - Historical pop-up course passage
 - This is an interdisciplinary course that draws on faculty throughout the university
- WHY NOT CCC+ NOW?
 - This is not a gen ed course
 - Longer approval process that inhibits flexibility

Still up for discussion

We are aware that there have been concerns regarding accreditation and will be addressing them.

Call to Action to Senate

Our Ask:

- Senators to discuss with constituencies any thoughts or considerations for the presented bylaw
- Your preparation for a vote on the bylaw in the April 2023 senate meeting

Our Goal:

- A Senate presentation and vote in April 2023
- Bylaw implementation beginning with Fall 2024 incoming students
- Actions towards implementation including Communication plan, and enrollment management and registration occur in 2023-2034

Proposed Bylaw: "Every undergraduate student at UConn must pass the 1 credit UNIV 3088: Special Topics: U.S. Anti-Black Racism as part of the baccalaureate degree requirements. It is strongly recommended that the course be completed during the first two years of enrollment at the University."