



Second Regular Meeting
2025-2026 Bradley University Senate
3:10 p.m., Thursday October 16, 2025
Michel Student Center - Ballroom
Presiding: Travis Stern, President
Minutes recorded by: Karl Jung, Secretary

I. Call to Order

Called to order at 3:10.

II. Announcements

1. The meeting is being recorded and livestreamed. Thank you, IT!
2. Parliamentary advisor
3. Forums for Academic Integrity Policy discussion
 - a. Tuesday, October 21 2-3pm WES 130
 - b. Friday, October 24 12-1pm WES 130
 - c. Wednesday, November 5 3-4pm BECC 1150/1160
 - d. Tuesday, November 11 11am-12pm WES 116
4. Roberts Rules Primer

III. Approval of Minutes – Please see attached minutes

Approval of the Minutes of the First Regular Meeting of the 2025-2026 University Senate, September 18, 2025.

Motion: David Daye

Second: Eden Blair

Discussion: Teresa Drake offered corrections

Vote: Unanimous

Approved as corrected

IV. Report from Student Senate President Al Cuizon, Jr.

Al Cuizon, Jr. shared updates from the Student Senate and discussed the following topics:

- Membership
- Committee considerations
- AI Forum scheduled October 27 @ 5pm
- Celebrated Founders Day
- Student participation in ERP workshops
- Participating in Big Table Forum

V. Reports from Committees

A. Curriculum and Regulations – Chair Rachel Vollmer

1. Curriculum Consent Items

- **Course Addition**

266350 HIS 355 AI and Social Research 3.0
This course contextualizes the development of AI in the history of computing, social science research, and the history of technology and society, promoting a broader understanding of ongoing change.

Course Addition approved at C&R 10/7/25

- **Course Modifications**

~~255955 CE 365 Reinforced Concrete Design 3.0~~
~~*Updating the course description and prerequisites; adding new materials to the curriculum.*~~

266276 CHM 110 General Chemistry I 3.0
Change in catalog course language to more clearly articulate the prerequisites.

264170 NUR 417 Senior Practicum II 2.5
Changing the course description

264265 NUR 200 Fundamentals of Nursing – Theory 4.0
Changing the prerequisites because of the deletion of CHM 162

264266 NUR 203 Fundamentals of Nursing – Practicum 2.0
Changing the prerequisites because of the deletion of CHM 162

All Course Modifications approved at C&R 10/7/25

- **Bradley Core Curriculum**

Core Practices Tags

Experiential Learning (EL) Tag

265040 PLS Constitutional Law: Civil Rights and Civil Liberties

Writing Intensive (WI) Tag

266657 ART 260 Money and Materials in Global Art History

Areas of Inquiry

Social and Behavioral area

267743 COM 101 Survey of Communication

Multidisciplinary Integration area

263178 MUS 102 The Music Business for Performing & Composing Professionals

263703 KHS 362 Essential Clinical Neuroanatomy

264124 PLS 310 Political Behavior

264563 ART 227 Basic Graphic Design

266355 HIS 355 AI and Social Science Research

Natural Science area
266471 CON 320 Soil Mechanics

All Bradley Core Curriculum items approved at C&R 10/7/25

Adopted by unanimous consent

2. Curriculum Items Requiring a Motion

- **Major Deletion**

267721 COM Unclassified Communication
The major is no longer needed with COM Communications Studies major

Major deletion approved at C&R 10/7/25

Motion to approve by Rachel Vollmer
Approved: Unanimously

- **Major Modifications**

265386 PSL Political Science
Due to the discontinuation of the International Studies Program, the PSL department submitted a major modification to account for changes in course names and course numberings.

267627 ART Art and Design Studio Complementary Major
Change the name from Art and Design Studio Complementary Major to Visual Arts Complementary Major.

All Major Modifications approved at C&R 10/7/25

Motion to approve by Rachel Vollmer
Approved: Unanimously

- **Minor Addition**

266880 COM Media Production
The media production minor will equip students with vital hands-on skills essential for today's media landscape.

Minor Addition approved at C&R 10/7/25

Motion to approve by Rachel Vollmer
Approved: Unanimously

- **Program Deletion**

264211 NUR GRD RNI RN to MSN Nursing Informatics (online)
Program never generated enrollment

Program Deletion approved at C&R 10/7/25

Motion to approve by Rachel Vollmer
Approved: Unanimously

- **Concentration Deletion**

267529 CS Concentration in Mobile Computing

The Mobile Computing concentration has remained inactive with no enrollment over the past five academic years.

Concentration Deletion approved at C&R 10/7/25

Motion to approve by Rachel Vollmer
Approved: Unanimously

Report from Rachel Vollmer:

- Issues with course deletions coming through without changes to majors and end up with majors in catalog listing courses that no longer exist.
- Going to be using the “Table” function to send back to originator when appropriate.

B. Confirmations/Approvals of Committee Memberships

Core Curriculum Committee:
Shawn Zheng – FCB

Core Practices Committee:
Raj Iyer – FCB

Contractual Arrangements Committee:
Crystal Elliot - HR

Motion from Travis Stern to confirm/approve memberships.

Discussion: None

Vote: Confirmed/Approved unanimously by voice vote

C. Strategic Planning Committee – Co-Chair Matt O’Brien

1. Reaffirmation of Vision Statement from Faculty Handbook

Resolution

To affirm the Vision Statement for Bradley University as it appears in the Faculty Handbook (p.3)

Bradley University is the leader in student engagement.

Vote: Approved unanimously by voice vote

VI. Reports from Administrators

A. President James Shadid

President James Shadid provided updates on the following topics:

- Update on Provost Search
- Enrollment Numbers as of October 14 in comparison to this time last year:
 - Applications in 2024 – 1549, as of 2025 – 2367
 - Admitted in 2024 – 137, as of 2025 – 1095
 - Deposits for 2024 – 0, as of 2025 – 17
 - Explained how NICHE Direct Admissions works
 - Work to do to ensure we yield these students
- Forthcoming joint statement from Senate Exec and President’s office affirming commitment and unity to focusing on enrollment as number one priority
- Enrollment Initiatives
 - Enrollment academy

Questions were asked and discussed related to the following topics:

- None

B. Interim Provost Dan Moon

No report.

VII. Unfinished Business

A. Reminder of Academic Integrity Policy proposal to be addressed at November 20 meeting

VIII. New Business

Proposed Handbook revision to Ensure No Double Votes in Tenure Process

Motion by Teresa Drake

Second: Twila Lukowiak

Discussion:

- Concern raised around terminology of ‘recommendation’, ‘poll’, ‘vote’ and ‘statement’ in the policy and somewhat ambiguous use across the policy.
- Concern raised around the lack of information about college level tenure and promotion committees within the process.

Handbook proposal will be voted on at the November 20th senate meeting.

Resolution on Unattributed Documents

Motion by Mathew Timm:

Whereas, Bradley administrators have recently, and on numerous earlier occasions, issued emails and other documents without attribution;

And, whereas, such unattributed documents indicate that their authors are unwilling to accept responsibility for the content of said emails and documents;

And whereas, that lack of acknowledge authorship of such emails and documents undermines confidence in the offices from which said documents emanate and, more generally, in the administration of the University;

And whereas, the dissemination of unattributed documents further diminishes staff and faculty morale;

Be it resolved, by this University Senate, on this 16th day of the month of October in the year 2025, that from this date forward, all emails and policy documents from administrative offices be on University letterhead, dated, and signed by the individual or individuals responsible for the content of said emails and documents.

Second: Kevin Kimberlin

Discussion:

- As an example of such documents, the “LAS Service departments” document was read into the record by Mathew Timm (attached).
- Discussion about including on university letterhead.

Subsidiary Motion

Jim Muncy: Motion to amend language – Strike “ on University letterhead”.

Vote: Amendment passed by show of hands

Amended Resolution on Unattributed Documents:

Whereas, Bradley administrators have recently, and on numerous earlier occasions, issued emails and other documents without attribution;

And, whereas, such unattributed documents indicate that their authors are unwilling to accept responsibility for the content of said emails and documents;

And whereas, that lack of acknowledge authorship of such emails and documents undermines confidence in the offices from which said documents emanate and, more generally, in the administration of the University;

And whereas, the dissemination of unattributed documents further diminishes staff and faculty morale;

Be it resolved, by this University Senate, on this 16th day of the month of October in the year 2025, that from this date forward, all emails and policy documents from administrative offices be dated and signed by the individual or individuals responsible for the content of said emails and documents.

Vote: Passed by voice vote.

Revision to Handbook Policy on Research Misconduct

Motion: Kristie McQuade

Discussion:

- Brad Andersh provided context for the revisions to meet federal guidelines.

Handbook proposal will be voted on at the November 20th senate meeting.

IX. Open Forum

Discussion for the common good without attachment to a motion. Meeting rules of Decorum still apply. Items discussed are recorded for the meeting minutes.

David Daye – Shared concern around lack of communication from University leadership around immigration and customs enforcement, what to do were that agency to come on and around campus, and what is the plan to protect students and faculty.

Eden Blair – Related request for policy around if/when faculty are required to open locked classrooms for any and all law enforcement.

X. Adjournment

Meeting Adjourned at 4:19.

UNIVERSITY SENATE MEETING SIGN IN SHEET –

SENATORS

Meeting Date:

10/16/25

2nd Regular Meeting 2025-2026

Name	Unit	Initials	Name	Unit	Initials
David Abzug	CFA	DNA	Kris Maillacheruvu	Int. Dean CCET&FCB	KM
Bill Bailey	FCB		Victoria Maneev	EHS	
Eden Blair	FCB	EB	Kristi McQuade	LAS	KM
Heather Brammeier	CFA	HBM	Cyle Metzger	CFA	CM
Erik Braun	EHS	EB	Dan Moon	Int. Provost	
Adam Byerly	Handbook Ed.	ABC	Sherri Morris	Int. Dean LAS	SM
Al Cuizon, Jr.	Student Sen. Pres.	AC	Libin Mou	LAS	
David Daye	CFA	DD	Jim Muncy	FCB	JM
Ryan Dodd	Student Rep.	RCD	Lee Newton	LAS	LN
Teresa Drake	Imm. Past Sen. Pres	TD	Jessica Nigg	EHS	JN
Ahmad Fakheri	CCET	AF	Renee Pierce	EHS	RP
Edward Flint	LAS	EF	Melvy Portocarrero	LAS	
Lisa Friebohle	EHS	LF	Megan Rimmel	LAS	TD
Rustin Gates	LAS	RG	Val San Juan	LAS	VS
Danielle Glassmeyer	LAS	DG	Udo Schnupf	LAS	US
Amy Grugan	EHS	AG	James Shadid	President	JS
Ethan Ham	Dean CFA	EH	Prasad Shastry	CCET	PS
Samuel Hawkins	LAS	SH	Todd Spires	Exec. Dir. Library	
Jace Hayes-Hudson	Student Rep.	JH	Travis Stern	CFA	TWS
Ray Hazlip	CFA	RH	Naomi Stover	LAS	NS
Alexander Hertich	LAS	AH	Jennifer Stubbs	Library	
Jackie Hogan	LAS		Fred Tayyari	CCET	
Karl Jung	EHS	KJ	Nathan Thomas	VP Student Aff	NT
Andy Kelley	LAS	AK	Mathew Timm	LAS	M.T.
Todd Kelly	CFA	TK	Shannon Timpe	CCET	
Barb Kerns	CIO	BK	Libby Tronnes	Parliamentarian	
Yasser Khodair	CCET		Jeffrey Wanko	Dean EHS	JW
Kevin Kimberlin	LAS	KK	Jamie Way	EHS	JW
Andy Kindler	Registrar	AK	Chris Yench	FCB	CY
Kristina Latva	EHS		Shawn Zheng	FCB	ZS
Twila Lukowiak	EHS	TL			

61 total Senators – 31 needed for quorum

Resolution

To affirm the Vision Statement for Bradley University as it appears in the Faculty Handbook (p.3)

Bradley University is the leader in student engagement

Proposed Handbook Changes to Ensure No Double Votes in Tenure Process

P76
II, C, 2

2. General Procedures for Faculty Recommendations

- a. Recommendations for full-time appointment, reappointment, tenure and promotion shall originate with the department faculty, in accordance with procedures developed by the faculty of each College.
- b. The chairperson will initiate the recommendation process at the appropriate time.
- c. Prior to initiation of the recommendation procedures, any full-time faculty member may nominate for appointment, reappointment, or promotion.
- d. The recommendation of the faculty shall include the results of a poll of the group indicating the numbers supporting, opposing, and abstaining. It also may include, if the faculty wishes, a written statement approved by the appropriate faculty.
- e. The faculty recommendation will be conveyed to the chairperson who will add a recommendation to that of the faculty. At this stage of the process, the faculty member being considered may append written comments and documents to the recommendation.
- f. The chairperson will forward the recommendation to the Dean of the College, who will add a recommendation to the recommendatory package, and forward the whole to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.
- g. Once initiated, the promotion process may be terminated only by the faculty member's written request.
- h. Faculty members dissatisfied with their recommendations should consult this Faculty Handbook, Due Process, for the appropriate appeals procedures.

Proposed changes in red

2. General Procedures for Faculty Recommendations

- a. Recommendations for full-time appointment, reappointment, tenure and promotion shall originate with the department faculty, in accordance with procedures developed by the faculty of each College.
- b. The chairperson will initiate the recommendation process at the appropriate time.
- c. Prior to initiation of the recommendation procedures, any full-time faculty member may nominate for appointment, reappointment, or promotion.
- d. The recommendation of the faculty shall include the results of a poll of the group indicating the numbers supporting, opposing, and abstaining. It also may include, if the faculty wishes, a written statement approved by the appropriate faculty.
- e. The faculty recommendation will be conveyed to the chairperson who will add a recommendation to that of the faculty. At this stage of the process, the faculty member being considered may append written comments and documents to the recommendation.
 1. The department chairperson shall not register a poll vote at the department level. Rather, the department chairperson's recommendation shall serve as their only vote in any consideration of the faculty member's application at any level (i.e. department, college, university).
- f. The chairperson will forward the recommendation to the Dean of the College, who will add a recommendation to the recommendatory package, and forward the whole to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.
 1. The Dean shall not register a poll vote at the university level. Rather, the Dean's recommendation shall serve as their only vote in any consideration of the faculty member's application at any level (i.e. college, university).

	<p>g. Any person's poll vote or recommendation shall serve as their only vote in any consideration of the faculty member's application at any level (i.e. department, college, university).</p> <p>h. In cases of a tie vote at any level of consideration, the result shall be recorded as a tie (not as either a positive or negative recommendation).</p> <p>g i. Once initiated, the promotion process may be terminated only by the faculty member's written request.</p> <p>h j. Faculty members dissatisfied with their recommendations should consult this Faculty Handbook, Due Process, for the appropriate appeals procedures.</p>
--	---

Resolution on Unattributed Documents

Whereas, Bradley administrators have recently, and on numerous earlier occasions, issued emails and other documents without attribution;

And, whereas, such unattributed documents indicate that their authors are unwilling to accept responsibility for the content of said emails and documents;

And whereas, that lack of acknowledge authorship of such emails and documents undermines confidence in the offices from which said documents emanate and, more generally, in the administration of the University;

And whereas, the dissemination of unattributed documents further diminishes staff and faculty morale;

Be it resolved, by this University Senate, on this 16th day of the month of October in the year 2025, that from this date forward, all emails and policy documents from administrative offices be dated, and signed by the individual or individuals responsible for the content of said emails and documents.

LAS Service departments

Service departments play a vital role at Bradley University by providing an outstanding education in a discipline that is foundational to all undergraduate students. Although a service department may not have a stand-alone major program, this does not diminish the importance of such an academic unit at our institution. Through contributions to the Bradley Core Curriculum and required courses for a range of majors across the university, service departments are an essential part of the Bradley education. Because the students in these classes are majoring in an array of programs, faculty members in service departments need to understand and be attentive to the needs of the different populations and proficiency levels of the students in these classes. Teaching excellence and the success of students in these classes is of paramount importance. Success of the department will be determined primarily upon these areas of emphasis. With the emphasis on teaching, there is no scholarship requirement for the faculty of service departments. Service remains important as we continue to encourage all faculty to be active members of their department, college, and university communities.

Service departments are charged with delivery of content-specific courses required by the university. Management of the service department will fall to the Department Chair and the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies. The chair will be elected in accordance with the handbook language pertaining to chair elections, have one load release per year, and receive a stipend. The department will have a budget for student support services, and it will have a budget for professional development related to teaching (including travel funds) that will be dispersed as directed by the chair in collaboration with the Associate Dean in a manner that will ensure student success expectations are met by the department. Courses in the content area served by the unit will be scheduled by the chair in consultation with the Associate Dean. The curriculum provided by the unit, course additions, modifications and deletions, will be managed by the LAS Deans office in collaboration with the chair to ensure that the needs of the university, college and BCC are met. Faculty will be evaluated by the chair in collaboration with the Associate Dean of Undergraduate Studies.

<p>rarely.</p> <p>Bradley University expects research engaged in by members of the University community to conform to highest ethical standards.</p> <p>Anyone with concerns about impropriety in a research project should communicate those concerns through appropriate channels. If they cannot be communicated directly to the researchers involved, or if such action has an unsatisfactory result, then the concerns should be brought to the Associate Provost of Academic Affairs. In many cases, however, a person may not be able to determine whether the problem he or she perceives with a research project constitutes misconduct. The people listed in this document to whom formal allegations should be brought can provide guidance in ambiguous situations.</p> <p>In the event of a case of alleged misconduct, all persons involved in the proceedings are expected to cooperate fully and to conduct themselves in an ethical manner. They have an obligation to strive for impartiality and objectivity, with ample respect for the care needed in reviewing allegations of misconduct and the personal and professional harm that can result from unfounded accusations. Confidentiality in the proceedings is to be</p>	<p>Bradley University expects research engaged in by members of the University community to conform to the highest ethical standards. The University is committed to upholding standards of rigor in research and to fostering an environment that promotes research integrity and the responsible conduct of research, discourages research misconduct, and addresses allegations or evidence of possible research misconduct promptly.</p> <p>Anyone with concerns about impropriety in a research project should communicate those concerns to the researchers involved through appropriate channels. If the concerns cannot be communicated directly to the researchers involved, or if such action has an unsatisfactory result, then the concerns should be brought to the Associate Provost of Academic Affairs University's Research Integrity Officer (RIO). In many cases, however, a person may not be able to determine whether the problem he or she perceives with a research project constitutes misconduct. The people listed in this document to whom formal allegations should be brought can provide guidance in ambiguous situations. Note: Formal allegations may not be made anonymously, for this precludes the acquisition of further pertinent information from the complainant.</p> <p>In the event of a case of alleged misconduct, all persons involved in the proceedings are expected to cooperate fully and to conduct themselves in an ethical manner. They have an obligation to strive for impartiality and objectivity, with ample respect for the care needed in reviewing allegations of misconduct and the personal and professional harm that can result from unfounded accusations. Confidentiality in the proceedings is to be preserved to the greatest extent compatible with effective and efficient response. All parties are to be</p>	<p>New federal requirement that handbook must include statement of this nature</p> <p>Newly required position/title as per federal policy</p> <p>Proposing to delete because this is covered in the federal policy.</p> <p>Proposing to move the "Note" up from 8.c.1 from current language</p>
---	--	---

preserved to the greatest extent compatible with effective and efficient response. All parties are to be treated justly and fairly and with due respect to their reputations and future professional opportunities. The proceedings should be conducted as expeditiously as possible to arrive at a timely resolution of the charges.

b. Definitions

1) Research Misconduct

Research Misconduct is behavior that fails to respect the intellectual contributions or property of others, that intentionally impedes the progress of research, that risks corrupting the scientific record, or that compromises the integrity of scientific practices. Research misconduct does not include unintentional error or honest differences in interpretation or judgments of data. Examples of research misconduct include, but are not limited to the following:

a) Falsification of data

Fabrication of data, deceptive reporting of data, and/or purposeful omission of conflicting data.

b) Misrepresentation

Reckless disregard for the truth by stating or presenting a material or significant falsehood; or omitting a fact so that what is stated or presented as a whole states or presents a material or significant falsehood.

treated justly and fairly and with due respect to their reputations and future professional opportunities. The proceedings should be conducted as expeditiously as possible to arrive at a timely resolution of the charges.

~~b. Definitions~~

~~c. Procedures for Handling Allegations of Research Misconduct~~

b. Assignment of Roles for an Inquiry

If any administrative officer referred to herein has a conflict of interest in a case, or is the complainant, then the next higher administrative officer will appoint some other person to assume the responsibility.

1) Research Integrity Officer (RIO)

The Associate Provost of Academic Affairs will serve as the institutional RIO. They may counsel confidentially any individual who comes forward with an allegation of misconduct. The RIO will (1) inform the Executive Committee of the University Senate of the need for an inquiry, (2) notify the respondent of the charges and the process that will follow, and (3) complete the duties outlined in the University's policies and procedures document.

2) University Senate Executive Committee

The University Senate Executive Committee will appoint members to the Research Standards Committee, will decide the validity of a respondent's challenge to the Committee's composition, and will appoint any needed replacements.

Proposing to delete all definitions and procedures as they will be covered in the posted federal policy

Proposing this new subsection to define roles that are required by the federal policy.

c) Plagiarism

Representing another's work as one's own.

d) Misappropriating others' ideas

The unauthorized use of privileged information (such as violation of confidentiality in peer review), however obtained.

e) Interference

Intentionally and without authorization taking or sequestering or materially damaging any research-related property of another used or produced in the conduct of research.

f) Material failing to comply with established requirements that relate to the conduct of research

E.g., for the protection of researchers, human subjects, animal subjects, or the public.

g) Misappropriating research funds

Including, but not limited to, the diversion of external funds to purposes not appropriately related to the funded research project.

2) Academic Employee

Academic Employee means a University

3) Research Standards Committee

The Research Standards Committee shall consist of five full-time faculty members with relevant scientific expertise. The RIO shall participate as an ex officio and non-voting member.

4) Institutional Deciding Official (IDO)

The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs will serve as the IDO.

employee who ultimately reports to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

3) Complainant

Complainant means a person who makes an allegation of research misconduct.

4) Respondent

Respondent means the person against whom an allegation of research misconduct is directed or the person whose actions are the subject of the inquiry or investigation. There can be more than one respondent in an inquiry or investigation.

5) Allegation

Allegation means any written or oral statement or other indication of possible research misconduct made to an institutional official.

6) Good Faith Allegation

Good faith allegation means an allegation made with the honest belief that research misconduct may have occurred. An allegation is not in good faith if it is made with reckless disregard for or willful ignorance of facts that would disprove the allegation.

7) Inquiry

Inquiry is the initial fact-finding to determine whether an allegation or apparent instance of research misconduct warrants an investigation.

8) Investigation

Investigation means the formal examination and evaluation of all relevant facts to determine if misconduct has occurred, and, if so, to determine the responsible person and the seriousness of the misconduct.

9) Research Record

Research record means any data, document, computer file, computer diskette, or any other written or non-written account or object that reasonably may be expected to provide evidence or information regarding the proposed, conducted, or reported research that constitutes the subject of an allegation of research misconduct. A research record includes, but is not limited to, grant or contract application, whether funded or unfunded; grant or contract progress and other reports; laboratory notebooks; notes; correspondence; videos, photographs; X-ray film; slides; biological materials; computer files and printouts; manuscripts and publications; equipment use logs, laboratory procurement records; animal facility records; human and animal subject protocols; consent forms; medical charts; and patient research files.

10) Retaliation

Retaliation means any action that adversely affects the employment or other institutional status of an individual that is taken by an institution or an employee because the individual has made a good faith allegation of

research misconduct or of inadequate institutional response thereto or has cooperated in good faith with an investigation of such allegation.

C. Procedures for Handling Allegations of Research Misconduct

1) The Filing of a Complaint and the Initiation of an Inquiry

If any administrative officer referred to herein has a conflict of interest in a case, or is the complainant, then the next higher administrative officer will appoint some other person to assume the responsibility. Allegations of research misconduct shall be reported to the Associate Provost of Academic Affairs. He or she may counsel confidentially any individual who comes forward with an allegation of misconduct.

If consistent with law, regulations of the granting agency, and provisions of contracts, the University may seek informal resolution of the issue. Informal resolution could include direct discussion between the complainant and respondent or facilitated discussion including the Associate Provost of Academic Affairs, Department Chairs, Deans, or others.

If the Associate Provost of Academic Affairs determines that the concern does fall under the jurisdiction of this policy, he or she will discuss the inquiry and investigation procedures with the individual who has questions about the integrity of a research project (the complainant). If the complainant

chooses to make a formal allegation, a written complaint must be submitted to the Associate Provost of Academic Affairs specifying both the alleged misconduct and the evidence that supports the allegation.

Formal allegations may not be made anonymously, for this precludes the acquisition of further pertinent information from the complainant.

a) Initial Response to Possible Research Misconduct

If a formal complaint is filed, the Associate Provost of Academic Affairs must, within seven days, determine (a) if the alleged misconduct falls under the jurisdiction of the policy on research misconduct, and (b) if there is sufficient cause to warrant an inquiry. If the answers to both questions are yes, an inquiry must begin as soon as possible. If the answer to either question is no, then the Associate Provost of Academic Affairs will notify the complainant of the negative decision. When the Associate Provost of Academic Affairs determines an inquiry is not merited, the complainant may refile the complaint with the Associate Provost of Academic Affairs, who must initiate an inquiry.

If a formal complaint is not filed, the Associate Provost of Academic Affairs may still initiate an inquiry. Once aware of potential research misconduct, by whatever means, the Associate Provost of Academic Affairs is obligated to determine

whether the evidence appears strong enough to merit conducting an inquiry. If the evidence is strong enough to merit an inquiry, the Associate Provost of Academic Affairs will become the complainant filing a formal complaint with the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs. In such cases see above, c. 1) Paragraph 1.

The Associate Provost of Academic Affairs, or the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs if the Associate Provost of Academic Affairs file the complaint, initiate an inquiry by notifying in writing both the complainant and respondent that a request has been made to the Executive Committee of the University Senate to create a Research Standards Committee (See 3) b) below for details). It is the Research Standards Committee which conducts the inquiry and any subsequent investigation.

b) The Research Standards Committee

1) Purpose

A Research Standards Committee shall be created to conduct the inquiry, and if merited the investigation of the alleged research misconduct.

2) Committee Membership

The Research Standards Committee shall consist of five full-time faculty members, appointed by the Executive Committee of the University Senate.
The Associate Provost of Academic

Affairs shall participate as an ex-officio and non-voting member and serve as a resource person to the Executive Committee. Committee members should not have a close professional or personal affiliation with the complainant or the respondent in a given case. Committee members should be unbiased, have appropriate academic or other backgrounds for judging the issues being raised, and have no real or apparent conflicts of interest with the case being investigated.

Immediately upon creation of the Research Standards Committee, the Associate Provost of Academic Affairs will notify the respondent of the Committee's membership. The composition of the Committee may be challenged for cause by the respondent. Any respondent challenges to the Committee's composition must be submitted in writing to the Associate Provost of Academic Affairs within five days of the respondent being notified of the Committee's membership. The University Senate Executive Committee will decide the validity of a challenge for cause and appoint any needed replacements.

3) Structure and Resources

The Committee will elect a chairperson and secretary, who will maintain

Committee records. All records will be securely stored at the Office of the Associate Provost of Academic Affairs. The Committee may call upon the Office of the Associate Provost of Academic Affairs for support beyond maintaining records (e.g., any financial resources required for the Committee to call upon on- or off campus consultants necessary to assist in reviewing a case). When necessary in either inquiry or investigation, the Committee may call upon experts.

2) Inquiry

a) Purpose

In the inquiry, factual information is gathered and expeditiously reviewed to determine if an investigation of the charge is warranted. An inquiry is not a formal hearing, nor is it to conclude that misconduct has occurred; it is intended to separate allegations deserving of further and more detailed examination from frivolous, unjustified, or clearly mistaken allegations.

b) Process

To initiate an inquiry, the Associate Provost of Academic Affairs shall (1) inform the Executive Committee of the University Senate of the need for an inquiry, and (2) notify the respondent of the charges and the process that will follow. Notification will be made in writing and copies will be

securely maintained and held confidential in the office of the Associate Provost of Academic Affairs. The only role of the Executive Committee of the University Senate is to promptly form the Research Standards Committee. The Associate Provost of Academic Affairs should provide the Executive Committee with the information necessary for the appointment of Research Standards Committee that is neutral and possesses the needed expertise for the case.

All meetings of the Committee will be closed and kept confidential.

The respondent is obligated to cooperate in providing the material necessary to conduct the inquiry and will be so informed by the Committee when the inquiry is initiated. Uncooperative behavior may result in immediate implementation of a formal investigation and appropriate institutional sanctions. The respondent will be given an opportunity to comment on the allegations during the inquiry and to respond to a draft copy of the inquiry findings. If he or she comments on that report, the comments may be made part of the final inquiry record. The respondent may address the Committee, if he or she desires. When appearing before the Committee the respondent may be accompanied by an advisor and/or counsel of choice at the respondent's expense; however, the advisor and/or counsel is advisory only and will not be permitted to speak on the respondent's behalf.

Inquiries should be resolved expeditiously. The inquiry phase should be completed and the final report of the findings submitted to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs within 60 days of the initiation of the inquiry or within a shorter time period if so specified by a funding agency. If the Committee anticipates that the established deadline cannot be met, it should submit to the Provost a report citing the reasons for the delay and describing progress to date; it should also inform the respondent and other involved individuals. If the inquiry takes longer than 60 days to complete, the final report will include documentation of the reasons for exceeding 60 days.

The University will, to the greatest extent possible, protect the complainant against retaliation. Individuals engaging in acts of retaliation will be subject to grievance proceedings and/or disciplinary action.

c) Findings

After receiving the written report of the inquiry, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs shall render a decision on whether or not the allegations merit an investigation. The report is to state what evidence was reviewed, summarize relevant interviews, describe the process and conclusion of the inquiry, and include a recommendation on whether an investigation is merited. It is to be sufficiently detailed to permit a later

assessment of the reasons supporting the inquiry findings.

The report and all other inquiry records will be retained in a confidential and secure file in the Office of the Associate Provost of Academic Affairs for at least three years after the completion of the inquiry. This file will not become a part of the respondent's employment or student record at the University unless a subsequent investigation results in a final determination of research misconduct.

In the case of allegations found to warrant an investigation, the existing Research Standards Committee will promptly initiate such an investigation.

If an allegation is found to be unsupported, but has been submitted in good faith, no further formal action, other than informing all parties involved in the inquiry, will be taken. The record and findings of the inquiry, including the identity of the respondent, will be held confidential to the greatest extent possible to protect the parties involved.

d) Reporting to the Funding Agency

If the alleged research misconduct involves an externally funded project, the Associate Provost of Academic Affairs will convey to the funding agency the information required by the regulations of the funding agency.

3) Investigation

a) Purpose

The Research Standards Committee will initiate an investigation only after the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs decides that an investigation is warranted. The investigation broadens the scope of the inquiry and is the formal examination and evaluation of all pertinent facts to determine whether misconduct has occurred. The investigation should look carefully at the substance of the charges and examine all relevant evidence. The investigation findings and recommendations are advisory. They will be submitted to, and reviewed by, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs who will make the determination.

b) Process

Upon completion of an inquiry and the determination by Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs' that an investigation is warranted, the Research Standards Committee will initiate the investigation within 30 days.

The Committee's investigation may consist of a combination of activities including, but not limited to:

- 1) Review of data, proposals, correspondence, and other pertinent documents at the University, at the granting agency, or elsewhere;

- 2) Review of published materials and of manuscripts submitted or in preparation;
- 3) Inspection of laboratory or other facilities and/or materials;
- 4) Interviewing of parties with an involvement in, or knowledge about the case, including both the complainant and the respondent. Complete summaries of these interviews should be prepared, provided to the interviewed party for comment or revision, and included as part of the documentary record of the investigation.

All involved University parties are obligated to cooperate with the proceedings in providing information relating to the case. All relevant documentary information must be provided to the respondent in a timely manner to facilitate the preparation of a response. The respondent will be provided the opportunity during the investigation to address the charges and evidence in detail and may address the Committee in person if he or she desires. The complainant will have the opportunity to review the evidence to ensure completeness.

All meetings of the Committee will be closed and considered confidential. When appearing before the Committee the respondent may be accompanied by an advisor and/or counsel of choice at the

respondent's expense; however, the advisor and/or counsel is advisory only and will not be permitted to speak on the respondent's behalf.

In the course of an investigation, additional information may emerge that justifies broadening the scope of the investigation beyond the initial allegations. The respondent will be informed when significant new directions of investigations are undertaken.

After conducting the investigation, the Committee will prepare a draft report of findings, provide a copy to the respondent for comment, and then incorporate the respondent's comments (if any) in the final report. This final report must:

- a) Describe the alleged research misconduct;
- b) Include the actual text or an accurate summary of the views of the respondent;
- c) Describe how and from whom information was obtained;
- d) Detail the Research Standards Committee's findings and the basis for those findings;
- e) Include the respondent's comments on the draft report of findings;
- f) Include one of the following

summary findings:

- 1) No research misconduct was committed;
 - 2) No research misconduct was committed, but serious scientific or other research errors were committed;
 - 3) Research misconduct was committed.
- g) Detail the Research Standards Committee's recommendations for the resolution of the case, including correction of the research record if there is a finding of research misconduct or research error;
- h) Recommend sanctions if there is a finding of misconduct (See 5) c) below).

4) Submission of Findings

The Research Standards Committee then will submit the final report to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

Investigations should be conducted as expeditiously as possible. An investigation ordinarily should be completed within 120 days of its initiation (including submission of the final report). However, the nature of some cases may render the deadline difficult to meet. If the Committee determines that the full

process cannot be completed in 120 days, then an interim report is to be submitted to the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs prior to the end of 120 days with a request for an extension.

5) Determination of the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs

The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs will review the final Committee report and, within 30 days, make a determination on the case. If the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs rejects the Committee's findings and recommendations, the reasons for doing so will be reported in writing to the Committee. The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs will meet with the Committee to explain the reasons for overriding the summary finding and recommendations of the Committee.

After making the determination, and resolving any disagreement with the Committee, the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs will confidentially submit the (1) determination, (2) Committee's final report, and (3) description of any sanctions to be imposed by the University to the respondent(s), each respondent's department chair and college dean, the Associate Provost of Academic Affairs, and the funding agency, if any. If there is more than one respondent then each will receive all those parts of the full report that are pertinent to his or her role in the case. A copy of this full report and all documentation relevant to substantiating the investigation's

findings will be kept in a secure and confidential file in the Office of the Associate Provost of Academic Affairs. If there is a final determination of misconduct, then the full report will become part of the respondent's employment or student file at the University. The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs will also inform the complainant of the decision on whether or not research misconduct occurred.

Additional follow-up action that must be taken after the determination is made:

a) No Finding of Research Misconduct

All persons and agencies/organizations informed of the investigation must be notified promptly of the finding of no misconduct.

If the unsubstantiated allegations of misconduct are found to have been maliciously motivated, appropriate grievance procedures or disciplinary action may be initiated against the complainant. If the allegations, however incorrect, are found to have been made in good faith, no disciplinary measures will be taken and efforts will be made to prevent retaliatory action against the complainant.

b) No Finding of Research Misconduct, but Finding of Serious Carelessness or Serious Scientific or Other Research Error

All persons and agencies/organizations informed of the investigation must be notified promptly of the finding of no misconduct. In the event that the Committee discovers serious research errors, it will include in its final report specific recommendations for action to correct the errors. The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs will follow up on these recommendations or refer them to another appropriate administrative official (department chair, dean, or other) or University Senate committee for action.

c) Finding of Research Misconduct

The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs will be responsible for disposition of the matter through the University's regular personnel procedures, and in conformity with the Faculty Handbook. Sanctions can range from removal from the research project, to reprimand, to financial restitution, to termination of employment. Other Research Standards Committee recommendations may include notifying editors of journals in which the respondent's research was published or to which manuscripts were sent, other institutions with which the respondent has been affiliated, collaborators, professional societies, and, if applicable, state professional licensing boards or criminal authorities. The Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs will follow up on these recommendations or refer them to another

appropriate administrative official (department chair, dean, or other) or University Senate committee for action.

6) Appeal

No University sanctions will be imposed before an appeal has run its course; nor will findings be considered final until the appeal process is complete.

If the respondent does not concur with the Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs' determination, the respondent may, within 30 days of the distribution of that determination, file a written appeal with the President of the University Senate for submission to the appropriate University Senate committee. Either the findings, or the sanctions, or both, may be appealed. An appeal must be restricted to the body of evidence already presented, and the grounds for appeal must be limited to failure to follow appropriate procedures in the investigation, or arbitrary and capricious decision-making, or sanctions not in keeping with the findings. The decision of the President of the University is the final University determination.