

BYLAWS CHANGE

ARTICLE V. COMMITTEES

SECTION 8. REVIEW COMMITTEE FOR SCHOLARLY MISCONDUCT DECISIONS

- A. **FUNCTION.** Deals with academic staff appeals of decisions that scholarly misconduct has occurred.\*
- B. **PANEL OF REVIEWERS.** A 12 person panel of reviewers will be established by the Nominating Committee with 2 panel members from each of the following 6 areas: Biological Sciences, Engineering, Humanities, Medical Sciences, Physical Sciences, and Social Sciences. Panel members will serve for three years and may be reappointed.
- C. **REVIEW COMMITTEES.** When a review is requested, the Academic Staff Executive Committee will select 5 panel members for each review. For purposes of selection, the 6 areas will be paired as follows: Biological/Medical Sciences, Humanities/Social Sciences and Engineering/Physical Sciences. The panel shall consist of 2 academic staff from the area of the person requesting the review, 1 person from the second area in that pairing, and 1 person from each of the other pairings.
- D. **FINAL SELECTION.** Prior to finalizing the appointment of any specific review committee, ASEC shall ask the academic staff member who requested the review if there is any objection to any of their selections and shall consider any objections prior to officially appointing the committee.
- E. **OPERATIONAL PROCEDURES.** Each Review Committee will establish its own rules and procedures for conducting a review.
- F. **COMPLETION OF REVIEW.** A Review Committee should ordinarily complete its review within 30 working days of receipt of written and/or oral statements from the academic staff member and the hearing committee. This includes the transmission of a formal recommendation to the Chancellor.

-----  
\*Excerpt from Academic Staff Document #072 (2-11-91), Procedures For Dealing With Misconduct In Scholarly Research:

"Within 10 days of the receipt of the hearing committee's final decision, an academic staff member may ask for review of the decision by the Review Committee For Scholarly Misconduct Decisions on the hearing committee record on either or both of these grounds: 1) that the decision of the hearing committee is clearly erroneous; 2) that the recommended sanction is inappropriate." (p7)