

University Senate Meeting
May 1, 2023
WebEx Virtual Meeting

Call to Order

Moderator **Dineen** called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

1. Approval of Minutes

- April 3, 2023, University Senate meeting
The minutes of the meeting were approved as written.

2. Report of the President

Presented by President Radenka Maric

President **Maric** expressed her deep gratitude and appreciation to the Senate for their work during this past academic year and began her report.

- President **Maric** opened the floor to **Nathan Fuerst** who reported on enrollment trends for the 2023-2024 year. Nathan Fuerst shared that the university received 48,000 applications for the upcoming academic year, with an increase of 1,000 from Connecticut residents, and he anticipates the university will meet its fall enrollment goal of 4100 first year students by today's enrollment deposit deadline. Enrollment for regional campuses is also on track. There were no questions.
- President **Maric** invited **Jeff Geoghegan** to speak on the University budget. He reported that work has been done to reduce the budget shortfall projected for FY 2024 and 2025 with the state appropriations committee in the form of a one-time additional funding of \$75 million. Additionally, the university found savings of \$9 million in pension rates. He reported that the university will enter FY 2024 with a shortfall of \$69 million and FY 2025 with a shortfall of \$46 million and explained that his office will continue to remain engaged with leaders in the state legislature to address these shortfalls. He stated that the final budget will be voted on by the senate and the house on June 7th, 2023. Moderator Dineen opened the floor to questions.
 - Senator **Morrell** asked about how the university will address budget shortfalls, understanding that the funding for FY 2024 is a one-time payment. President **Maric** responded that the university is working on a strategic plan to reduce reliance on the state for budgeting and using benchmarking of other universities to compare. Jeff **Geoghegan**

clarified that all decisions will be based on the budget passed on June 7th, which will apply for the next two years.

- Senator **Dormidontova** asked about the percentage of the deficit belonging to the Storrs campus compared to the School of Medicine, and which percentage budget cut can be expected in Storrs. Jeff **Geoghegan** clarified that the deficit is split approximately 50/50 so any cuts would be a part of the strategic planning process. He reiterated that the hope is that the university will receive additional funding from the state in the final budget and then a financial improvement plan similar to what took place this past year would be considered. He highlighted that hiring and payroll processes are key expenditures that can contribute to savings due to attrition, turnover and filling positions at a slower pace.
- President **Maric** gave an update on the Search for the CEO of the University Foundation and highlighted that Jon Greenblatt is currently serving in the interim role. She invited Provost **D'Alleva** to report on active Deans searches. Provost D'Alleva announced that Victoria Vaughan Dickson has been hired as the new Dean of the School of Nursing and thanked Dean Deborah Chyun for her five years of service in this role. Provost **D'Alleva** also announced that the search for the new Dean of the School of Social Work will conclude shortly and an announcement on this new appointment will be made later this week. She also stated that a search for the Dean of the School of Engineering will launch in the fall, and that a search recently launched for the Dean of the School of Fine Arts. She thanked Alain Frogley for acting as Interim Dean until a new Dean is identified and appointed. There were no questions for Provost **D'Alleva**.

3. Report of the Senate Executive Committee

Attachment #1

Presented by SEC Chair Del Siegle

Senator **Siegle** thanked the Senate Office staff for their work over the past academic year and concluded his final report. There were no questions for Senator **Siegle**.

Senator **Wagner** thanked Senator **Siegle** for his service as SEC chair and welcomed Senator Laura Burton to the role.

4. Consent Agenda Items:

Attachment #2

Report of the Senate Curricula and Courses Committee
Annual Reports of Senate Committees

By voice vote, the consent agenda passed unanimously.

5. Report from Nominating Committee

Attachment #3

VOTE on 2023/2024 Senate Standing Committee Rosters

Presented by Senator Burton

Senator **Burton** presented the Senate Nominating Committee Rosters discussed at the April meeting for a vote.

By voice vote, the 2022/2023 Senate Standing Committee Rosters passed unanimously.

6. Report from the Curricula and Courses Committee

Attachment #4

VOTE on a motion to amend the By-Laws, Rules, and Regulations of the University Senate, C.2.b, Competencies (Seal of Biliteracy)

Presented by CCC+ Chair Pam Bedore

Senator **Bedore** presented proposed changes to the By-Laws, Rules, and Regulations of the University Senate, C.2.b, Competencies (Seal of Biliteracy).

There were no questions for Senator **Bedore**.

The motion passed with 71 YAY, 0 NAY, and 4 ABSTENTIONS.

7. Report from Scholastic Standards Committee

Attachment #5

VOTE on a motion to amend the By-Laws, Rules, and Regulations of the University Senate, II.E.6, Scholastic Standing, Mid-Semester and Semester Reports

Presented by Co-Chair Bresciano

Senator **Bresciano** presented proposed changes to the By-Laws, Rules, and Regulations of the University Senate, II.E.6, Scholastic Standing, Mid-Semester and Semester Reports.

There were no questions for Senator **Bresciano**.

The motion passed with 65 YAY, 6 NAY, and 1 ABSTENTION

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 Kersaint

Senator **Kersaint** presented proposed changes to the By-Laws, Rules, and Regulations of the University Senate, II.D. 1 1. Cheating – Student Academic Misconduct.

This proposed change was presented at the February 6, 2023 meeting of the University Senate. Senator **Kersaint** presented additional clarifying information regarding the motion prior to the vote. She summarized that the proposed change seeks to overhaul the current practice where there are separate policies governing undergraduate and graduate education, as well as research misconduct, and combine them under one policy. She stated that today's vote is to approve the policy as written in the by-laws amendment and also presented details of the proposed procedures, which are separate from the policy and not to be enacted until an Office of Academic Integrity is established. She presented a budget construct for this proposed office. Senator **Dineen** opened the floor to questions.

Senator **Morrell** asked for clarification on the budget, particularly in light of the fact that the university is currently operating in a deficit. Senator **Kersaint** responded that this is challenging to assess because this topic affects multiple units across the university and would ultimately be up to the Provost.

Senator **Jockusch** asked a clarifying question regarding how this would apply to post-doctoral positions. Senator **Kersaint** asked that Senator **Bresciano** be recognized to answer this question. Senator **Bresciano** clarified that in this case post-doctoral students would be recognized as staff members and not students who would face consequences of academic misconduct.

Senator **Govoni** asked a clarifying question about the proposed steps for students in the procedures and whether students would have an opportunity to contest an accusation of academic misconduct in a meeting rather than exclusively in a written statement, citing concerns that students may be disadvantaged by not moving automatically to a hearing. Senator **Kersaint** stated that the first step in the new proposed procedures would be an informational meeting.

Senator **Dormidontova** raised concerns regarding combining research and academic misconduct in one policy, as well as concerns regarding budgetary considerations to establish this new office, and a question regarding the time

commitment required by committee members involved in the proposed process. Senator **Dormidontova** also suggested postponing voting on this item to next semester, citing a sense of feeling rushed to make a decision at the end of this academic year without having had sufficient time to review the proposal. Senator **Kersaint** stated it was not the intent of the Taskforce to delay presenting these materials to the Senate until February, 2023, and that scheduling constraints and other Senate priorities meant it was the earliest point to present. She also confirmed that the Graduate Faculty Council voted on the policy and endorsed the procedures during the fall 2022 semester. in the fall semester. Senator Kersaint also stated that the committees presented in the proposed procedures would have enough members so that participating in hearings should not be a burden to those participants.

Senator **Bedore** proposed a closure of discussion and move to vote on the motion. Senator **Siegle** seconded. By voice vote, the Senate moved to vote on the motion.

The motion passed with 34 YAY, 29 NAY, and 1 ABSTENTION

- 8. Report from Anti-Black Racism Course Working Group** Attachment #6
VOTE on a motion to amend the By-Laws, Rules, and Regulations of the University Senate, II.C.2.D (renumber from D), Minimum Requirements for Undergraduate Degrees, General Education Curriculum
Presented by Co-Chairs Salvant and Santos

Senator **Salvant** presented proposed changes to the By-Laws, Rules, and Regulations of the University Senate, II.C.2.D (renumber from D), Minimum Requirements for Undergraduate Degrees, General Education Curriculum. Moderator Dineen opened the floor to questions.

Senator **Jockusch** asked for more information regarding the reasoning behind requiring a specific course rather than including learning objectives or additional courses to general education requirements. Senator **Salvant** responded that the charge of the Taskforce by the SEC was to design an ABR course proposal and clarified that, in principal, they are not opposed to any other curricular changes, and reiterated that this course does not diminish any other of the broader forms of discrimination against other groups.

Senator **Holle** asked whether considerations were made regarding seat numbers for this course, and ensuring students can participate in the course within their first two years of matriculation to avoid conflict with major-specific credit hour limitations,

referring specifically to challenges faced by students enrolled in the School of Pharmacy. Senator Salvant responded that the online modality, and availability of the course during Fall, Spring and Summer terms should offer enough flexibility to students to avoid interference with any other graduation requirements.

Senator **Rubega** spoke in support of the motion.

Senator **Zane** spoke in support of the motion and cited a petition circulated amongst faculty in non-departmentally organized units and affiliates which received 69 signatures. Senator **Zane** read the petition to the group.

Senator **Bedore** spoke in support of the motion.

Senator **Spinelli** shared a statement written by the Undergraduate Student Governing Board in support of the motion.

Senator **Wagner** spoke in support of the motion.

Senator **Chang** spoke in support of the motion.

Senator **Dormidontova** asked why this proposed course cannot be accumulated within general education courses, and satisfy the general education requirement. Senator **Salvant** clarified that the course is within the general education structure and has its own learning objectives. Moderator **Dineen** invited Senator **Bedore** to speak. Senator **Bedore** spoke about the Core Curriculum construction and how it addresses issues of diversity, multiculturalism and justice. She stated that it was discussed whether these courses fulfill the demand of students, and stated that the unique aspect of the proposed course is that it is not developed from a specific unit and does not fit into the three credit model of the topic of enquiry courses.

Senator **Elliott** expressed concerns that the motion does not fit within the Common Core structure, and stated a desire to find a way to fit this course into curricular structures more broadly rather than as a mandate which may pose a potential academic burden to students.

Senator **Willen** spoke in support of the motion.

Senator **Holland** stated that through data and conversations with students, the course has not been perceived as an academic burden. Senator **Holland**

acknowledged this course as the first of its kind to be passed in this manner as a positive change, establishing a unifying experience for students, and one which can pave pathways for other such courses to emerge.

Senator **Jockusch** clarified their earlier question and asked whether there is a pathway to revisit folding this course into general education requirements at a later date, after today's vote. Moderator **Dineen** invited Senator **Bedore** to speak. Senator **Bedore** stated that if today's vote passes and the course comes to the CCC that they could investigate further.

Senator **Agocha** said he would like to propose an amendment to the motion. Moderator **Dineen** asked Senator **Agocha** to share the language for the amendment. Senator **Agocha** shared the proposed language for the amendment. Discussion ensued regarding procedure in this case, and it was determined that the statement did not change the nature of the motion and thus would not be voted on as an amendment.

Senator **Morrell** asked a clarifying question regarding statements made by other senators on this approval acting as a gateway to similar one-credit courses and requirements. Senator Salvant responded that there is nothing in the language that would preclude or negate the possibility of new courses being implemented.

Senator **Holland** stated that the undergraduate student government would welcome that we are voting what is specifically written in the by-laws.

The motion passed with 36 YAY, 25 NAY, and 4 ABSTENTIONS

9. New Business

Senator **Park Boush** made an announcement on behalf of the budget committee regarding the FAQ on the university budget process in the annual report. She said she will circulate this to the senate at-large and will request that it is on the agenda for the first meeting in September.

Thank you from Moderator **Dineen**.

10. Adjournment

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

The motion passed unanimously.
The meeting was adjourned at 6:09 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Michelle Everard
Staff Member, Office of the Provost
Recording Viewed September 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
May 1, 2023

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

- A. HIST/AAAS 2811 Early Modern India: From Muslim Rulers to British Raj [CA1, CA4] (#18366)

Proposed Catalog Copy

HIST 2811. Early Modern India: From Muslim Rulers to British Raj

Also Offered As: AAAS 2811.

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: None.

Grading Basis: Graded

History of India from the 1200s to the 1800s, including the rise and fall of the Muslim-dominated Mughal Empire and the advent of British colonialism. CA 1. CA 4-INT.

AAAS 2811. Early Modern India: From Muslim Rulers to British Raj

Also Offered As: HIST 2811.

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: None.

Grading Basis: Graded

History of India from the 1200s to the 1800s, including the rise and fall of the Muslim-dominated Mughal Empire and the advent of British colonialism. CA 1. CA 4-INT.

- B. HIST AAAS 2821 Early Modern China: From Mongols to Manchus [CA1, CA4-Int] (#18165)

Proposed Catalog Copy

HIST 2821. Early Modern China: From Mongols to Manchus

Also Offered as: AAAS 2821

3.00 Credits

Prerequisites: None

Grading Basis: Graded

Survey of Chinese history from 1200 to 1800. Topics include economic growth, imperial expansion, ethnic diversity, relations with foreign countries, intellectual currents, and state-society relations. CA 1. CA 4-INT.

AAAS 2821. Early Modern China: From Mongols to Manchus

Also Offered as: HIST 2821

3.00 Credits

Prerequisites: None

Grading Basis: Graded

Survey of Chinese history from 1200 to 1800. Topics include economic growth, imperial expansion, ethnic diversity, relations with foreign countries, intellectual currents, and state-society relations. CA 1. CA 4-INT.

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

A. ENGL 2401 Poetry [CA1, W] (#5796) [Add W version]

Current Catalog Copy

ENGL 2401. Poetry

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011 or 2011.

Grading Basis: Graded

A study of the techniques and conventions of the chief forms and traditions of poetry in English.
CA 1.

Revised Catalog Copy

ENGL 2401. Poetry

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011 or 2011.

Grading Basis: Graded

A study of the techniques and conventions of the chief forms and traditions of poetry in English.
CA 1.

ENGL 2401W. Poetry

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011 or 2011.

Grading Basis: Graded

A study of the techniques and conventions of the chief forms and traditions of poetry in English.
CA 1.

B. UNIV 2230 The PA2SS Program, Mentoring African American Students (#17346) [Revise title]

Current Catalog Copy

UNIV 2230. The PA2SS Program, Mentoring African American Students

1.00 credits | May be repeated for a total of 4 credits.

Prerequisites: Open to sophomores or higher.

Grading Basis: Graded

Successful mentoring strategies and strategies for effective communication and discourse.

Students will learn about and recognize the consequences of stereotype threat and will develop proficiency in mentoring African American college students to become lifelong learners.

Revised Catalog Copy

UNIV 2230. The BLACC Program, Black Leadership and Community Cultivation

1.00 credits | May be repeated for a total of 4 credits.

Prerequisites: Open to sophomores or higher.

Grading Basis: Graded

Successful mentoring strategies and strategies for effective communication and discourse.

Students will learn about and recognize the consequences of stereotype threat and will develop proficiency in mentoring African American college students to become lifelong learners.

III. 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/AAAS 3823 History of the People's Republic of China [CA1, CA4-Int] (#17185)

Proposed Catalog Copy

HIST 3823. History of the People's Republic of China.

Also offered as AAAS 3823.

3.00 credits.

Prerequisites: none.

Grading basis: Graded.

Survey of the political, social, economic, and cultural history of the People's Republic of China (PRC) since 1949, with focus on social struggle, state-building, and economic development. CA 1. CA 4-INT.

AAAS 3823. History of the People's Republic of China.

Also offered as HIST 3823.

3.00 credits.

Prerequisites: none.

Grading basis: Graded.

Survey of the political, social, economic, and cultural history of the People's Republic of China (PRC) since 1949, with focus on social struggle, state-building, and economic development. CA 1. CA 4-INT.

B. HIST/AAAS/HRTS 3846/W Genocide and Mass Killings in Asia [CA4-Int, W] (#16845)

Proposed Catalog Copy

HIST 3846. Genocide and Mass Killings in Asia

Also offered as: AAAS 3846, HRTS 3846.

3.00 Credits

Prerequisites: None

Grading Basis: Graded

Case studies of historical and/or contemporary genocide and mass killings in Asia. May focus on any time period and any part of the continent. CA 4-INT.

HIST 3846W. Genocide and Mass Killings in Asia

Also offered as: AAAS 3846W, HRTS 3846W.

3.00 Credits

Prerequisites: ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011.

Grading Basis: Graded

Case studies of historical and/or contemporary genocide and mass killings in Asia. May focus on any time period and any part of the continent. CA 4-INT.

AAAS 3846. Genocide and Mass Killings in Asia

Also offered as: HIST 3846, HRTS 3846.

3.00 Credits

Prerequisites: None

Grading Basis: Graded

Case studies of historical and/or contemporary genocide and mass killings in Asia. May focus on any time period and any part of the continent. CA 4-INT.

AAAS 3846W. Genocide and Mass Killings in Asia

Also offered as: HIST 3846W, HRTS 3846W.

3.00 Credits

Prerequisites: ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011.

Grading Basis: Graded

Case studies of historical and/or contemporary genocide and mass killings in Asia. May focus on any time period and any part of the continent. CA 4-INT.

HRTS 3846. Genocide and Mass Killings in Asia

Also offered as: AAAS 3846, HIST 3846.

3.00 Credits

Prerequisites: None

Grading Basis: Graded

Case studies of historical and/or contemporary genocide and mass killings in Asia. May focus on any time period and any part of the continent. CA 4-INT.

HRTS 3846W. Genocide and Mass Killings in Asia

Also offered as: AAAS 3846W, HIST 3846W.

3.00 Credits

Prerequisites: ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011.

Grading Basis: Graded

Case studies of historical and/or contemporary genocide and mass killings in Asia. May focus on any time period and any part of the continent. CA4-INT.

IV. 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. BUSN 3003W Business Communications [W] (#17285) [Revise prereqs]

Current Catalog Copy

BUSN 3003W. Business Communications

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011 or 2011; Open only to Business Majors of sophomore or higher status. Not open for credit to students who have passed BUSN 3002W or BADM 4075W or MENT 3070W.

Grading Basis: Graded

Techniques for improving professional writing and oral communications skills and ways in which visual communications, document design, and use of workplace technologies shape the message.

Revised Catalog Copy

BUSN 3003W. Business Communications

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011; Open only to Business Majors of sophomore or higher status. Not open for credit to students who have passed BUSN 3002W or 3004W, or BADM 4075W or MENT 3070W.

Grading Basis: Graded

Techniques for improving professional writing and oral communications skills and ways in which visual communications, document design, and use of workplace technologies shape the message

B. COMM 3420/W Health Communication [W] (#18206) [Revise prereqs]

Current Catalog Copy

COMM 3420. Health Communication

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: COMM 2300 or 2500.

Recommended preparation: COMM 2000Q.

Grading Basis: Graded

Overview of health communication, including health behavior change interventions, emergency communication, risk assessment, media influences, provider-patient communication, socialization and identity, stereotyping, social support, diverse populations, and new communication technologies. Formerly offered as COMM 4700.

COMM 3420W. Health Communication

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: COMM 2300 or 2500; ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011 or 2011.

Recommended preparation: COMM 2000Q.

Grading Basis: Graded

Overview of health communication, including health behavior change interventions, emergency communication, risk assessment, media influences, provider-patient communication, socialization and identity, stereotyping, social support, diverse populations, and new communication technologies. Formerly offered as COMM 4700.

Revised Catalog Copy

COMM 3420. Health Communication

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: COMM 1000.

Recommended preparation: COMM 2300 or 2500.

Grading Basis: Graded

Overview of health communication, including health behavior change interventions, emergency communication, risk assessment, media influences, provider-patient communication, socialization and identity, stereotyping, social support, diverse populations, and new communication technologies. Formerly offered as COMM 4700.

COMM 3420W. Health Communication

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: COMM 1000; ENGL 1007 or 1010 or 1011.

Recommended preparation: COMM 2300 or 2500.

Grading Basis: Graded

Overview of health communication, including health behavior change interventions, emergency communication, risk assessment, media influences, provider-patient communication, socialization and identity, stereotyping, social support, diverse populations, and new communication technologies. Formerly offered as COMM 4700W.

- C. HIST/AAAS 3810 China and the West [CA1, CA4-Int] (#18445) [Revise number/level and description, add cross-listing and CA1 & CA4-Int]

Current Catalog Copy

HIST 3810. China and the West

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: Open to sophomores or higher. Not open to students who took HIST 3995 when offered as China and the West.

Grading Basis: Graded

China's political, economic, and cultural encounters with Western Powers from the sixteenth century to 1949.

Revised Catalog Copy

HIST 2866. China and the West

Also offered as: AAAS 2866

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: None.

Grading Basis: Graded

Survey of China's political and cultural encounters with the West from the sixteenth-century to 1949. Situates these encounters within the context of world history and a dialogue among civilizations. CA 1. CA 4-INT.

AAAS 2866. China and the West

Also offered as: HIST 2866

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: None.

Grading Basis: Graded

Survey of China's political and cultural encounters with the West from the sixteenth-century to 1949. Situates these encounters within the context of world history and a dialogue among civilizations. CA 1. CA 4-INT.

- D. HIST/AAAS 3812 Modern India [CA1, CA4-Int] (#18367) [Revise level, title, and description, add CA1, CA4-Int]

Current Catalog Copy

HIST 3812. Modern India

Also offered as: AAAS 3812

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: None.

Grading Basis: Graded

An introduction to the history of India from the Mughal and European invasions of the 16th Century to the present. India's synthesis of Eastern and Western culture, traditional and new, will be the focus.

AAAS 3812. Modern India

Also offered as: HIST 3812

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: None.

Grading Basis: Graded

An introduction to the history of India from the Mughal and European invasions of the 16th Century to the present. India's synthesis of Eastern and Western culture, traditional and new, will be the focus.

Revised Catalog Copy

HIST 2812. Modern India: From Western Domination to Divided Nation

Also offered as: AAAS 2812

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: None.

Grading Basis: Graded

History of India from the 1800s to the contemporary era, including colonialism under the British crown, the movement for independence, economic development, and ethnic and religious conflict. CA 1. CA 4-INT.

AAAS 2812. Modern India: From Western Domination to Divided Nation

Also offered as: HIST 2812

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: None.

Grading Basis: Graded

History of India from the 1800s to the contemporary era, including colonialism under the British crown, the movement for independence, economic development, and ethnic and religious conflict. CA 1. CA 4-INT.

E. HIST/AAAS 3822 Modern China [CA1, CA4-Int] (#18325) [Revise level]

Current Catalog Copy

HIST 3822. Modern China

Also offered as: AAAS 3822

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: None.

Grading Basis: Graded

Survey of patterns of modern China since 1800. Topics will include reforms and revolutions, industrialization and urbanization, and family and population growth. CA 1. CA 4-INT.

AAAS 3822. Modern China

Also offered as: HIST 3822

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: None.

Grading Basis: Graded

Survey of patterns of modern China since 1800. Topics will include reforms and revolutions, industrialization and urbanization, and family and population growth. CA 1. CA 4-INT.

Revised Catalog Copy

HIST 2822. Modern China

Also offered as: AAAS 2822

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: None.

Grading Basis: Graded

Survey of patterns of modern China since 1800. Topics will include reforms and revolutions, industrialization and urbanization, and family and population growth. CA 1. CA 4-INT.

AAAS 2822. Modern China

Also offered as: HIST 2822

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: None.

Grading Basis: Graded

Survey of patterns of modern China since 1800. Topics will include reforms and revolutions, industrialization and urbanization, and family and population growth. CA 1. CA 4-INT.

- F. HIST/AFRA 3753 Modern African History [CA1, CA4-Int] (#5915) [Revise description; add CA1, CA4-Int]

Current Catalog Copy

HIST 3753. History of Modern Africa

Also offered as: AFRA 3753

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: None.

Grading Basis: Graded

The history of African perceptions of and responses to the abolition of the slave trade, Western imperialism and colonialism, and the development of nationalism and struggle for independence.

AFRA 3753. History of Modern Africa

Also offered as: HIST 3753

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: None.

Grading Basis: Graded

The history of African perceptions of and responses to the abolition of the slave trade, Western imperialism and colonialism, and the development of nationalism and struggle for independence.

Revised Catalog Copy

HIST 3753. History of Modern Africa

Also offered as: AFRA 3753

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: None.

Grading Basis: Graded

An interdisciplinary analysis of the history of African perceptions of and responses to the abolition of the slave trade, Western imperialism and colonialism, and the development of nationalism and struggle for independence. CA 1. CA 4-INT.

AFRA 3753. History of Modern Africa

Also offered as: HIST 3753

3.00 credits

Prerequisites: None.

Grading Basis: Graded

An interdisciplinary analysis of the history of African perceptions of and responses to the abolition of the slave trade, Western imperialism and colonialism, and the development of nationalism and struggle for independence. CA 1. CA 4-INT.

V. The Chair of the Senate Curricula and Courses Committee recommends approval of the following Pop-up Course:

- A. UNIV 3088 Variable Topics (Feeling Well: The Science and Practice of Emotional Well-Being) (#19425)

VI. The Senate Curricula and Courses Committee recommend one offering of the following Special Topics Courses:

- A. ANTH 1095 Special Topics (Introducing Decolonization and Indigenous Worlds) (N/A)
- B. UNIV 3995 Special Topics (The Science and Practice of Living a Purposeful Life) (#18585)

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, Terra Zuidema (Registrar alternate), and Karen McDermott (Program Assistant)

From the 4/3/23 meeting.

**Senate Nominating Committee
2023-2024 Senate Committee Rosters**

Each standing committee of the Senate will include two undergraduates and one graduate student.

Curricula & Courses Committee

Chair: TBD

*Dorothea Anagnostopoulos, Neag School of Education, Associate Dean

*Pam Bedore, Chair of GEOC, (Ex-Officio)

*John Chandy, Engineering, ECE

*Louis Hanzlik, SFA, Music – possible sabbatical in sp24

*Dan Mercier, Academic Affairs, AVP

*Tina Reardon, Waterbury, History

*Suzanne, Wilson, Ed Curriculum & Leadership

Peter Diplock, Associate Vice Provost, CETL (Ex-Officio)

Marc Hatfield, Registrar's Office

Matt McKenzie, History, Avery Point Campus

David Ouimette, First Year Programs and Learning Communities

Sharyn Rusch, CLAS Academic Services

Steve Stifano, CLAS, Communication (C&C Chair)

Terra Zuidema, Registrar's Office alternate

Enrollment Committee Members

***Catherine Little, Chair, Education, Educational Psychology**

*Robin Bogner, Pharmacy, Pharmaceutical Science

*Jamie Caruso, Waterbury, Staff

*Miranda Davis, CLAS, Ecology & Evolutionary Biology

*Bryan Huey, Engineering, MSE

*Natalie Munroe, CLAS, Anthropology

*Anastasio Tzingounis, CLAS, PNB

*Nat Trumbull, AVP

*Xiaojing, Wang, CLAS, Statistics

*Mark Zurolo, SFA, Art & Art History

Nathan Fuerst, Vice President for Enrollment Planning & Management (Ex-Officio Member)

Vern Granger, Office of Admissions

Jennifer Morenus, PRLACC

Mansour Ndiaye, CLAS Academic Services

Faculty Standards Committee Members

***Dan Burkey, Chair, Engineering, Associate Dean**

*Bede Agocha, CLAS, Africana Studies Institute

*Mary Ann Amalaradjou, CAHNR

*Valarie Artigas, School of Nursing

*Kelly Herd, Business, Marketing

*Lisa Holle, Pharmacy Practice

*Elizabeth Jockusch, CLAS, Ecology & Evolutionary Biology

*Elaine Lee, CAHNR, Kinesiology

*Vicki Magley, CLAS, Psychological Sciences

*Betsy McCoach, Neag, Educational Psychology

George McManus, CLAS, Avery Point

John Richardson, School of Fine Arts, Art & Art History

Martina Rosenberg, CETL, Faculty Development

Jeffrey Shoulson, Senior Vice Provost (Ex-Officio member)

JEDI Committee Members

***Martha Cutter, Chair, CLAS, English**

*Becky Bacher, CLAS Advising

*Caitlin Elsaesser, School of Social Work

*Kristen Govoni, CAHNR

*Micah Heumann, ISS, ACES

*Diane Lillo-Martin, Linguistics

*Greg Reilly, Business, Management

*Jennifer Pascal, Engineering, Chemical & Molecular

*Diandra Prescod, Neag

*Margaret Rubega, CLAS, Ecology and Evolutionary Biology

*Urios-Aparisi, Eduardo, CLAS, LCL

*Yaowu, Yuan, CLAS, EEB

*Cindy Zhang, CLAS, Geography

Stuart Duncan, The Graduate School

Greg Bouquot, Registrar's Office

Stephany Santos, School of Engineering, Biomedical Engineering

Audrey Silva, Center for Students with Disabilities

Frank Tuitt, Vice President for Diversity and Inclusion & Chief Diversity Officer (Ex-Officio Member)

Scholastic Standards Committee Members:

***Karen Bresciano, Co-Chair, The Graduate School**

***Jamie Kleinman, Co-Chair, CLAS, Psychological Sciences, Avery Point**

*Maureen Armstrong, Dean of Students Office

*Kelly Burke, Engineering, Chem & Biomolecular

*Robin Coulter, Business, Marketing

*Carrie Fernandes, Financial Aid

* Holly Fitch, CLAS, Psychology

*Morty Ortega, CAHNR, Natural Resources and the Environment

*Lawrence Walsh, Office of Admissions

Erin Ciarimboli, Office of Undergraduate Advising

Sarah Croucher, Provost's Office, Academic Affairs

Lindsay Cummings, SFA, Dramatic Arts

Jennifer Lease Butts, Associate Vice Provost for Enrichment Programs (Ex-Officio Member)

Brian Rockwood, Registrar's Office

Lauren Schlesselman, CETL, Academic Program Assessment and Learning Initiatives

Christine Wenzel, Center for Students with Disabilities

Student Welfare Committee Members

***Leo Lachut, ISS, Academic Achievement Center**

*Tom Bontly, CLAS, Philosophy

*Laura Burton, Neag

*Andy Bush, CLAS, Earth Sciences

*Jennifer Dineen, Public Policy, Hartford

*Kate Fuller, UConn Libraries

*Erica Granoff, Stamford, Student Services

*Tina McCarthy, SHaW

*Sarah Scheidel, Enrichment Programs

*Fiona Vernal, CLAS, History

Megan Petsa, The Graduate School

Bryanna Anderson, Center for Students with Disabilities

Fabiana Cardetti, CLAS, Mathematics

Kimberly DUBY, Dean of Students Office

Arthur Galinat, International Student & Scholar Services

Michael Gilbert, Vice President of Student Affairs (Ex-Officio Member)

Mona Lucas, Enrollment Planning and Management

Suzanne Peters, Financial Aid

Jennifer Gattilia Tibbetts, Registrar's Office

Peter Tribuzio, Student Services, Hartford Campus

University Budget Committee Members:

*Lisa Park Boush, Co-Chair, CLAS, Earth Sciences

*Michael Morrell, Co-Chair, CLAS, Political Science

*Eleni Coundouriotis, CLAS, English

*Elena Dormidontova, CLAS, Physics

*Sandy Grande, CLAS, Political Science

*Jeffrey McCutcheon, Engineering, Chemical & Biomolecular Engineering

*Michael White, Dining Services

Jeffrey Geoghegan, EVP for Finance & CFO UConn and UConn Health (Ex-Officio Member)

Anne Langley, UConn Library

Steve Marchillo, SSW, Director of Finance

Michael Vertefeuille, SFA, Digital Media and Design

Dave Weber, School of Business

Reka Wrynn, Budget, Planning and Institutional Research

University Planning Committee Members

*Bonnie Burr, Chair, CAHNR, Extension

*Amvrossios Bagtzoglou, Engineering, Civil & Environmental

*Oksan Bayulgen, CLAS, Political Science

*Joanne Conover, CLAS, Physiology & Neurobiology

*Joe Crivello, CLAS, PNB

*Carl Rivers, Office of the Registrar

*Justin Rogowski, Law Library

*Mike Shor, CLAS, Economics

Tutita Casa, Neag School of Education

Gladis Kersaint, Vice Provost for Strategic Initiatives (Ex-Officio Member)

Common Curriculum Committee+
Report to the Senate
April 3, 2023

Add Seal of Biliteracy to Second Language Competency

Rationale:

Students currently fulfill the Second Language Competency of General Education by either completing a third-year high school level course in a language other than English or the second semester course in the first-year sequence of college level study in a language other than English.

In 2017, the Connecticut State Seal of Biliteracy was established to recognize public high school graduates who have attained a level of proficiency in English and one or more other languages (Public Act 17-29, signed by CT governor 6.6.2017). The Seal of Biliteracy has been adopted in 49 states and in Washington DC. Four universities on UConn's peer and aspirant list now accept it:

- Indiana University
- University of Utah
- University of Illinois - Urbana-Champaign
- University of Maryland

Given that the Seal of Biliteracy involves a validated test equivalent to the second semester course in the first-year sequence of college level study, the CCC+ proposes to add this option as a means of satisfying the Second Language Competency of General Education.

This proposal was approved by CCC+ on 2.27.2023, and by the Senate C&C on 3.6.2023. It has also been shared with the Courses and Curriculum Committees of the School of Business and the College of Liberal Arts & Sciences so they can deliberate whether or not the Seal of Biliteracy should fulfill the additional Second Language Competency requirement for their students.

Current By-Law Language:

C.2.b Competencies

The General Education Curriculum includes competencies in information literacy, quantitative skills, second language proficiency, and writing. The coursework required to demonstrate Information Literacy is established by each major field of study. Quantitative Literacy is established by completing two courses that are designated for this purpose as Q courses. One Q course must be a MATH or STAT course. Second Language competency is established by passing either 1) the third-year high school level course in a language other than English or 2) the second semester course in the first-year sequence of college level study in a language other

than English. Writing competency is established by passing two courses that are designated for this purpose as W courses, one of which must be in the major field of study at the 2000-level or above. First-year writing courses are prerequisites for W courses.

Proposed By-Law Language:

C.2.b Competencies

The General Education Curriculum includes competencies in information literacy, quantitative skills, second language proficiency, and writing. The coursework required to demonstrate Information Literacy is established by each major field of study. Quantitative Literacy is established by completing two courses that are designated for this purpose as Q courses. One Q course must be a MATH or STAT course. Second Language competency is established by passing either 1) passing the third-year high school level course in a language other than English or 2) attaining a Seal of Biliteracy or 3) passing the second semester course in the first-year sequence of college level study in a language other than English. Writing competency is established by passing two courses that are designated for this purpose as W courses, one of which must be in the major field of study at the 2000-level or above. First-year writing courses are prerequisites for W courses.

**Scholastic Standards Committee
To the University Senate
Present: 4.3.2023 & Vote: 5.1.2023**

Background:

There is an existing bylaw requirement that instructors of 1000- and 2000-level courses notify the Registrar by the end of the sixth week of the semester, those students who appear to be in danger of earning less than a 'C', or 'U' or 'N' grades (considered "warning" grades).

The percentage of faculty who have been compliant with this by-law has historically been low, and for several years, the deadline has been (unofficially) extended from the sixth week to the ninth week, in order to increase compliance and for more student grades to be considered. Additionally, as of the 2021-22 academic year, faculty have been encouraged to submit *all* grades for 1000- and 2000-level classes, not just warning grades. This latter change has not only increased the number of grades submitted for courses in total, but has allowed academic advisors and student support offices on campus to have a more holistic picture of a student's academic progress at the midterm. This has also permitted increased outreach and student support before the 11th week of classes, which is the deadline for students to change to P/F grading, as well as to withdrawal from courses with a "W."

The changes we are suggesting below aim to make the by-law language clearer to faculty what is expected (reflecting a later deadline for submission of midterm grades) as well as make the submissions more effective and efficient for faculty, staff, and students in order to help as a tool for holistic student success and decision-making.

These changes include:

- Requiring submission of *all* midterm grades for 1000/2000 level courses, but strongly suggesting submission of midterm grades for all undergraduate and graduate courses
- A specific carve out stating that Early College Experience (ECE) courses do not need to submit midterm grades
- Clear guidance that the grades must be entered in StudentAdmin, not just in HuskyCT
- Pushing back the deadline to the end of week eight (8).

Current By-Law:

By-Laws, Rules, and Regulations of the University Senate, II.E.6, Scholastic Standing, Mid-Semester and Semester Reports

6. *Mid-Semester and Semester Reports*

Mid-Semester Report. Instructors of 1000- and 2000-level courses shall notify the Registrar by the end of the sixth week of the semester of students who appear to be in danger of earning less than a 'C', or 'U' or 'N' grades. The Registrar will inform the students. The mid-semester report grade information is not part of the student's permanent file.

Semester Report. The Registrar provides to the student a semester report, which includes all courses for which the student is registered, the credit value of each course, and the student's grade in each course.

Proposed By-Law:

By-Laws, Rules, and Regulations of the University Senate, II.E.6, Scholastic Standing, Mid-Semester and Semester Reports

6. *Mid-Semester and Semester Reports*

Mid-Semester Report. Instructors of 1000- and 2000-level courses must submit mid-semester grades for all enrolled students through the Student Administration System during the mid-semester grading period which spans the sixth through eighth week of the semester shall notify the Registrar by the end of the sixth week of the semester of students who appear to be in danger of earning less than a 'C', or 'U' or 'N' grades. Instructors of all other undergraduate and graduate courses are encouraged to submit mid-semester grades. Students, academic advisors, and relevant student success offices will be informed of all submitted mid-semester grades. The Registrar will inform the students. The mid-semester information is an indicator of the student's performance at the date of submission and is not recorded on a student's transcript ~~report grade information is not part of the student's permanent file.~~ Instructors of Early College Experience courses are exempt from this requirement.

Semester Report. Students have access to semester grade reports in the Student Administration System. ~~The Registrar provides to the student a semester report, which~~ These includes all courses for which the student is registered, the credit value of each course, and the student's grade in each course.

**Scholastic Standards Committee
To the University Senate
Present: 2.6.2023 & Vote: 5.1.2023**

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*

The proposed action by the University Senate will do the following:

1. **Decommission the following documents and replace**
 - Current language in “11 Cheating: Student Academic Misconduct” in the University Senate Rules and Regulations (see below)
 - [Appendix A: Academic Integrity in Undergraduate Education](#) (Community Standards)
 - [Policy on Scholarly Integrity in Graduate Education and Research](#)
 - [Complaint, Appeal, and Hearing Procedures](#)
2. **Add information related to Research** (i.e., development research activity to train researchers or to address issues that fall outside the scope of the [OVPR Research Misconduct policy](#). For example, although we are increasing attention to undergraduate research, possible misconduct related to such activities were not previously addressed.
3. **Replace the four documents listed in #1 with the policy and procedures (jointly owned by University Senate and Graduate Faculty Council) to serve both undergraduate and graduate education (and postdocs) – i.e., a ONE UConn approach to Academic, Scholarly, and Professional Integrity.**
 - Policy on Academic, Scholarly, and Professional Integrity and Misconduct
 - Procedures for Addressing Alleged Violations of the Policy on Academic, Scholarly, and Professional Integrity

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:

11. Academic, Scholarly, and Professional Integrity and Misconduct

Issues related to academic, scholarly, and professional integrity at the University of Connecticut are governed by the Policy on Academic, Scholarly, and Professional Integrity and Misconduct Policy (DATE) and the Procedures for Addressing Alleged Violations of the Policy on Academic, Scholarly, and Professional Integrity.

To recommend substantive changes to the policy or procedures document, a committee that brings together representatives from University Senate, The Graduate Faculty Council, and the unit(s) responsible for implementing the policy must be convened. The committee must bring those recommended changes to the University Senate and Graduate Faculty Council, and each body must vote to approve any changes before they are implemented.

**Current By-Law (with markup showing integrated policy & procedures):
By-Laws, Rules, and Regulations of the University Senate, II.D.11, Cheating- Student Academic Misconduct**

11. Cheating—Student Academic Misconduct

11. Academic, Scholarly, and Professional Integrity and 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).

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)

~~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."~~

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.

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.

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 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 consequences or 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 ten 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 consequence 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.

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

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.

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 consequences or 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 consequences outlined in *The Student Code* to determine if an agreement about additional sanctions consequences can be reached. If an agreement cannot be reached between a student and Community Standards, the case will be heard by the Board.

II. 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 penalt(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:
- *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 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

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.

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.

Hearing on Academic Misconduct

If the Board finds that the student is "Not Responsible" "In Violation" for the alleged misconduct the Board shall not impose any sanctions consequences 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" "Not in Violation", 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 consequences and recommend sanctions. The Board should apply these sanctions consequences in proportion to the severity of the misconduct. These sanctions may include any sanctions as described in *The Student Code*.

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.

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.

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.

**ABR Implementation Ad Hoc
To the University Senate
Present 4.3.2023 & Vote 5.1.2023**

Background:

Having received the Anti-Black Racism (ABR) Curriculum Working Group Report dated May 2, 2022, the Senate Executive Committee (SEC) formed an ABR Ad-Hoc Committee charged with preparing a proposal and implementation plan to include a mandatory Anti-Black Racism Course in the UConn Curriculum. The implementation plan includes information the committee deemed necessary to ensure adoption of the requirement for the incoming class of Fall 2024, including the following draft learning objectives:

1. Describe the foundational history and concepts related to systemic anti-Black racism in the United States using existing research.
2. Explain foundational scholarship focused on Black-Led movements and concepts such as Black civil rights, Black resistance, Black resilience, and intersectional solidarity.
3. Question the consequences of anti-Black racism in areas such as Black health and wellness; Black agency and resilience; and/or anti-Blackness in higher education.
4. Locate valuable resources throughout the University of Connecticut that work to disrupt anti-Black racism for the collective good.
5. Select critically engaged science, social science, and humanities courses offered by UConn that focus on anti-racism and appeal to your interests and plans of study.

The ABR Implementation Ad-Hoc continued deliberations and considered the questions and challenges included in the report and beyond. The following amendment is now being proposed as part of the current General Education Oversight Committee by-laws and with the expectation that it will be included in the Common Curriculum Committee by-laws that become effective in fall 2025.

Proposed By-Law Addition:

**By-Laws, Rules, and Regulations of the University Senate, II.C.2.D (renumber from D)
Minimum Requirements for Undergraduate Degrees, General Education Curriculum**

Every undergraduate student at UConn must pass the one-credit course titled 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.