



3-3-2016

March 3, 2016

University of North Dakota

[How does access to this work benefit you? Let us know!](#)

Follow this and additional works at: <https://commons.und.edu/und-senate-minutes>

Recommended Citation

University of North Dakota. "March 3, 2016" (2016). *University Senate Meeting Minutes*. 494.
<https://commons.und.edu/und-senate-minutes/494>

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the UND Publications at UND Scholarly Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in University Senate Meeting Minutes by an authorized administrator of UND Scholarly Commons. For more information, please contact und.common@library.und.edu.

Minutes of the University Senate Meeting
March 3, 2016

1.

The March meeting of the University Senate was held at 4:05 p.m. on Thursday, March 3, 2016 in Room 113, Education. Chair Rebecca Weaver-Hightower presided.

2.

The following members of the Senate were present:

Basile, Eric	Henderson, Pam	Porter, Kimberly
Beck, Pamela	Ho, I-Hsuan	Pupino, Kaaren
Borboa-Peterson, Stacey	Hunter, Cheryl	Quinn, Andrew
Burgess, Gaye	Jorgenson, Terra	Rakow, Lana
Campbell, Katherine	Juntunen, Cindy	Ray, Linda
Christopherson, Anne	Keengwe, Jared	Reesor, Lori
DiCristina, Bruce	Laguette, Soizik	Reissig, Brad
DiLorenzo, Thomas	Lawrence, David	Richards, Thomas
El-Rewini, Hesham	Liang, Lewis	Semke, William
Fazel-Rezai, Reza	Lim, Howe	Sheridan, William
Ferraro, Richard	Lindseth, Glenda	Smith, Bruce
Flynn, Amber	Mack, Marci	Stofferahn, Curt
Gedafa, Daba	Martin, Will	Tanaka, Tomohiro
Gjellstad, Melissa	McGimpsey, Grant	VanLooy, Jeffrey
Halgren, Cara	McGinniss, Mike	Walker, Stephanie
Harsell, Dana	Munski, Doug	Weaver-Hightower, Rebecca
	Pettinato, Tammy	Wood, Robert

3.

The following members of the Senate were absent:

Blanchard, Paige	Lange, Jacob	Schroeder, Nate
Bradley, April	Lawrence, Wesley	Sens, Donald
Brekke, Alice	Lerma, Sam	Sens, Mary Ann
Bridewell, John	Mosher, Sarah	Schafer, Ed
Brown, Ryan	Murphy, Eric	Staples, Cliff
Doze, Van	Nelson, Taylor	Stone, Lucian
Flint, Jamie	Noghanian, Sima	Storrs, Debbie
Hanson, Collin	Peshut, Conner	Sutton, James
Jendrysik, Mark	Rand, Kathryn	Swisher, Wayne
Johnson, Chase	Ring, Tanner	Takahashi, Shuzo
Kenville, Kim	Roux, Gayle	Walton, Susan
Kitzes, Adam	Sage, Melanie	Williams, Margaret
Kopp, Matthew	Schindler, Gary	Wynne, Joshua

4.

Ms. Weaver-Hightower thanked everyone for all of the extra time they put in attending presidential meetings and expressed how important she felt that this time was.

The following announcements were made:

- a. Update on Master Planning - Associate Professor Emily Cherry was recently appointed to the Committee and has spent time catching up on the information. She reported that the NDUS system has tasked the Committee to come up with a master plan for UND by February 15. This plan will be submitted to the NDUS system on April 15. There have been several open forums regarding this plan, which is still a work in progress.
- b. Update on PTE Working Group - Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, Steve Light; and Ryan Zerr, PTE Working Group Co-Chair.
 - There are three parts to this university-wide priority
 - The annual process is proceeding, with a focus from the VPAA office on facilitating clear and consistent review against standards, timeliness, and effective communication with faculty candidates, chairs, and deans. Candidates were reviewed by the University Promotion Committee, Committee of Academic Deans, and Provost, and now are under review by the President. Promotion candidacies are complete following presidential review, while tenure candidacies proceed to the SBHE for approval later this spring.
 - Essential Elements. Departments have been working with their deans and the VPAA office on review of departmental PTE guidelines for alignment with the Essential Elements, the key topic areas expected to be established in each department for clarity, transparency, and consistency. This process is continuing.
 - The PTE Working Group has met in the last month and identified subgroups to continue work on a revised Faculty Handbook. Topics include academic appointments, roles, and responsibilities; hiring and onboarding new faculty; annual and merit review; promotion and tenure policies and procedures; and expectations in rank. The Group is continuing to establish a timeline for drafting and campus input. Look for updates on the VPAA webpage and in the *University Letter* after each meeting. Each college has a representative on the committee/subcommittee.
- c. Update on the Employee Engagement Survey - Pam Henderson, Staff Senate President
 - Assessment Tool: 2016 Great Colleges to Work For, which is sponsored by the *Chronicle of Higher Education* and ModernThink, LLC. It was the most cost effective and time effective.
 - It will be sent to a random sampling of full-time faculty, adjunct faculty, administration, professional staff, and non-exempt staff, with 40% of each group, for a total of 1,000 survey invitations. The President will be sending out emails asking employees to participate.
 - The random sampling will be drawn by Institutional Research based on benefitted employees who have been an employee at UND for one year or more as of January 1, 2016. The reason for not surveying everyone is the cost.
 - The information that is gathered will be analyzed by the *Chronicle of Higher Education* and shared with the Staff Senate, administration and in open forums in the fall.
 - The launch date for the survey is March 14, 2016. The deadline to complete the survey is April 8, 2016. The assessment data will be forwarded back to UND in July and this data will be shared with the campus.

d. Ongoing Searches:

- Presidential Search Update - Dean Hesham El-Rewini thanked everyone for being active participants in the process. The Search Committee will be meeting March 11 and will recommend at least three candidates to the SBHE. Dean El-Rewini explained the process of the campus visits and who the candidates had met with.
- Graduate Dean Search Update - Dean Debbie Storrs reported that the search committee met on February 29 to discuss the applicants. A top tier of candidates was identified and the search consultant asked the candidates to complete another informational form that will be shared with the Committee. Dean Storrs reported that the top tier is a strong group of applicants with good representation in terms of gender, discipline, and ethnic/national origin. The Committee meets on March 9 with the search consultant to review the top tier of candidates and to whittle it down to a smaller number for phone interviews that will occur the week of March 21. The number of phone interviews will be determined by the Committee.
- Aerospace Dean Search Update - Associate Professor Soizik Laguette reported that the search is moving along nicely. The goal is a July 1 start date. A search firm has been hired and candidates will be reviewed next week. After spring break there will be a meeting with the firm to vet the list and interviews will begin at the end of March.
- International Center Director Search Update - Associate Vice President Sandra Mitchell reported that the search has begun. The position is posted internally and will likely be advertised externally soon. In an effort to save time, the search committee is being formed and applications are being solicited simultaneously. The goal is to have a director in place at the start of the fiscal year.
- Honors Director Search Update - Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs, Steve Light reported that, following the President's directive on hiring and searches, the Honors Director search is currently under review to determine the next steps. Look for an update in April.

e. New Business:

- New Parking Committee. The Parking Committee will be advisory to the Vice President for Finance and Operations regarding parking and transportation related strategic plans; parking enforcement and transportation policies; long-term maintenance, transportation, and circulation strategies; and parking, space assignment and permit strategies and fees. The Committee will also function as a communication platform between the campus community and the Department of Parking and Transportation, and collaborate with the city of Grand Forks to develop city-wide transportation programs. Additionally, the Committee will review the departmental operating budget, capital renewal and maintenance budgets. The members of the Committee are: Taylor Nelson, UND Student Government; Pam Henderson, UND Staff Senate; Tammy Hendrickson, UND College of Engineering and Mines; Michael Niedzielski, UND Geography; Jaakko Putkonen, UND Geology & Geological Engineering; Erik Martinson, UND Athletics; and Earl Haugen, Grand Forks/East Grand Forks Metropolitan Planning
- There will be a University Council meeting on Wednesday, March 9, at 3:00 p.m. in the Memorial Union Lecture Bowl. President Schafer will speak on the budget.

- Ms. Weaver-Hightower gave an update on the Senate Committee Chairs luncheon. During the luncheon, the chairs discussed working together with other committees.
 - Ms. Christopherson, Council of College Faculties (CCF) representative, reported that CCF is planning an All CCF Conference and looking at facilities to host the conference. She also introduced a resolution on the budget process that was recently endorsed by the CCF and that could be endorsed by the Senate, if it was so willing.
- f. Mr. Munski made a motion to add the CCF resolution to the business calendar. Ms. Rakow seconded, and the motion carried.

g. Forthcoming Events:

- Provost's updates - At the invitation of the University Senate, Provost DiLorenzo will give updates on University priorities on Tuesday, March 22 and Monday, April 25, both in the Lecture Bowl at the Union.
- Thursday forums:
 March 10 - Grant McGimpsey, Research Initiatives
 March 24 - Stephanie Walker, "Library Updates - Developing a 21st Century Academic Research Library System at UND"
- Please let Ms. Weaver-Hightower know if you are interested in the Collaborative Governance Book Group.
- Anti-bullying workshop - Conflict Resolution & Coping
 March 22, 9:00-11:00 a.m., Memorial Union, River Valley Room

6.

The minutes of the previous two meetings were presented. A motion was made by Mr. Stofferahn to approve the minutes of the two meetings as one. A second was made and the motion carried.

A motion was made by Mr. Munski to approve the January 14, 2016 and February 4, 2016 minutes. A second was made and the minutes were approved as distributed.

7.

The question period was opened at 4:48 p.m.

Mr. Sheridan asked who authored the CCF resolution. It was authored by the leadership of the UND, NDSU, and Minot State Senates, who recommended that the CCF take it up. Mr. Murphy made revisions to language before it reached the CCF, where it was endorsed and sent back to the individual Senates for further endorsements.

Ms. Rakow asked for an update on the administration evaluation process. Tom Petros gave an update. The Committee has met and they are fact gathering and will take the data and report back to the Senate with a recommendation in May.

Ms. Weaver-Hightower asked what the process for the presidential search is after the March 11 meeting. Dean El-Rewini explained that the hiring committee would forward at least three candidate names to the SBHE, all of whom will first be asked if they would accept the job if offered. The SBHE will make their recommendation to the Chancellor who will interview candidates on the forwarded short list, and will

then then make an offer, and if the offer is accepted, we will have a new president.

Mr. Munski asked if there was still a quorum present. He also asked if the advisor for the Student Government was in attendance. He then stated that he felt the Student Government was not represented and that they should be attending this meeting and that they are not being a part of shared governance. The University Senate attendance policy is that all University Senators are allowed two unexcused absences in a row before they are replaced.

The question period closed at 4:56 p.m.

8.

Mr. Munski moved to approve the annual reports of the Senate Student Academic Standards Committee, the Senate Administrative Procedures Committee, and the Senate Academic Policies & Admissions Committee. Ms. Henderson seconded and the reports were approved.

9.

The University Curriculum Committee report was reviewed. A motion was made and seconded to accept the report. Mr. Sheridan asked about the Bachelor of Science in Geology moving from the College of Arts and Sciences to the College of Engineering and Mines. Steve Light addressed the question. The motion was approved.

10.

The nominees for Senate Committees were presented. Nominations were taken from the floor. Nominations were closed and Mr. Sheridan made a motion to close the ballot and bring it to the April meeting so senators had time to look over the nominations. Mr. Harsell seconded, and the motion carried.

11.

The proposed changes to the Senate Library Committee charge were presented. A motion was made by Mr. Martin to change the membership to include two undergraduate students and one graduate student. A second was made by Mr. McGinnis and the Senate Library Committee charge was approved as amended.

12.

The proposed changes to the Misconduct in Scholarship (Creative Activity) Policy were presented. Ms. Halgren explained the changes:

Section 2 was: 1. Allegations Involving Students

The Allegation must be reported to the Integrity Officer who will make the decision as to whether the complaint should be handled in accordance with the procedures as stipulated in the *Code of Student Life* or the procedures as provided in this Policy. If the decision is to proceed utilizing the *Code of Student Life* process, each step of the process must be coordinated with the Integrity Officer in order to assure compliance with the procedures for timelines, decisions, and sanctions as prescribed in this Policy.

Changed Section 2: 2. Allegations Involving Students

The Allegation must be reported to the Integrity Officer who will make the decision as to whether the complaint should be handled in accordance with the procedures as stipulated in the *Code of Student Life* or the procedures as provided in this Policy. If the decision is to proceed utilizing the *Code of Student Life* process, the allegation will be forwarded to the Dean of Students or their designee.

A motion was made by Mr. Gedafa to approve the changes. A second was made by Ms. Porter and the motion carried.

13.

The following resolution was presented by the Council of College Faculties (CCF) representative, Anne Christopherson:

Whereas OMB currently predicts a \$1.074 billion shortfall for the current biennial budget;

Whereas the executive branch called for a 4.05 percent across the board budget cut for all state agencies excluding K-12 education;

Whereas higher education is a critical economic driver in the state;

Whereas shared governance within each NDUS institution is a foundational pillar of higher education; and

Whereas we have trust in cooperation between the SBHE, the Chancellor, the NDUS institutions and their faculties,

Be it resolved that the CCF and the faculty governance structure at all eleven NDUS institutions request that Presidents of institutions across the NDUS endorse

- the prioritization of the academic mission of each respective institution when making budget decisions, and
- the utilization of faculty input when recommending resource reallocation

and report to the Senate chairs and CCF chairs exactly how faculty participated and provided input into the budget reallocation process.

Ms. Rakow moved to endorse the CCF resolution, Ms. Christopherson seconded, and the motion carried.

14.

The meeting adjourned at 5:15 p.m.

Marci Mack, Secretary
University Senate

TO: University Senate

FROM: Marci Mack, Chair, Student Academic Standards Committee

DATE: March 3, 2016

RE: 2014-15 Annual Student Academic Standards Committee Report to Senate

The Student Academic Standards Committee, an appeals board, meets upon demand. The Committee functions within the guidelines approved by the Senate on February 3, 1983, as revised in April, 1985, and again as revised on March 4, 1999. A summary of the year's Probation/Suspension/Dismissal, Reinstatement, Academic Grievance and exceptions to admission standards activities is indicated below.

Because of the confidential nature of the information about the students, the Committee keeps no written minutes other than a statement about the action taken with respect to each student seeking reinstatement. When a grade grievance is the issue before the Committee, minutes are kept of the entire proceedings.

The Committee meets as needed, with the greatest demand usually occurring at a time immediately preceding the beginning of a term.

Fall 2014-Spring/Summer 2015, members held 7 meetings between the dates of December 18, 2014 and September 6, 2015.

Membership:

Spring, 2014

Andrew Quinn
 Doug Munski
 Tim Prescott
 Sarah Edwards
 Michael Flynn
 Vikki McCleary
 Alan Oberg - student member
 Sean McClain - student member
 Michael Mann - VPAA designee
 Suzanne Anderson - ex-officio
 non-voting chair

Fall, 2014 & Spring, 2015

Tim Prescott
 Janna Schill
 Michael Flynn
 Vikki McCleary
 Sherrie Fleshman
 Kim Kenville
 Michael Mann - VPAA designee
 McKenzie Darling - student member
 vacant - student member
 Suzanne Anderson - ex-officio
 non-voting chair

STUDENT ACADEMIC STANDARDS COMMITTEE SUMMARY REPORT FOR 2014-15

A. Students suspended:

1. Suspended after Spring Semester 2015 (1530)	210
2. Suspended after Summer Session 2015 (1540)	31
3. Suspended after Fall Semester 2014 (1510)	<u>170</u>
Total suspended for year	411

B. Students dismissed:

1. Dismissed after Spring Semester 2015 (1530)	17
2. Dismissed after Summer Session 2015 (1540)	4
3. Dismissed after Fall Semester 2014 (1510)	<u>14</u>
Total dismissed for year	35

C. Students reinstated by Deans	
1. Reinstated Spring Semester 2015 (1530)	87
2. Reinstated Summer Session 2015 (1540)	27
3. Reinstated Fall Semester 2014 (1510)	<u>151</u>
Total reinstatements by Dean for the year	265
D. Requests for Reinstatement by Committee	
1. Approved	8
2. Denied	5
3. No Action	0
E. Personal Appeals of Denied Reinstatements	
1. Approved	0
2. Denied	0
F. Academic Grievance Reviews	2
G. Students Admitted for Spring Semester 2015 (1530)	
Freshmen:	
1. Admitted as Exceptions	0
2. Admitted as Exemptions (not meeting HS core)	1
3. Denied	<u>4</u>
	5
Transfers (with fewer than 24 transferable credits):	
1. Admitted as Exceptions	0
2. Admitted as Exemptions (not meeting HS core)	0
3. Denied	<u>0</u>
	0
H. Students Admitted for Fall Semester 2014 (1510)	
Freshman:	
1. Admitted as Exceptions	9
2. Admitted as Exemptions (not meeting HS core)	18
3. Denied	<u>39</u>
	66
Transfer (with fewer than 24 transferable credits):	
1. Admitted as Exceptions	0
2. Admitted as Exemptions (not meeting HS core)	0
3. Denied	<u>1</u>
	1

TO: University Senate

FROM: Marci Mack, Chair, Administrative Procedures Committee

DATE: March 3, 2016

RE: 2014-15 Annual Administrative Procedures Committee Report to University Senate

I. The Administrative Procedures Committee met on 9 occasions to review student petitions for deviations from university-wide academic requirements and policies related to registration deadlines, grade changes, and all other administrative procedures not reserved to the jurisdiction of the Deans, except for general education requirements. The summary table below reports the activity of the committee from March 27, 2014 through March 5, 2015.

II. Membership:

Spring 2014

Tim Schroeder
 Daniel Malott
 Ken Ruit
 Doug Munski
 Robert Hill, Dean
 Gwen Halaas, Dean
 Jake Miller, Student
 Suzanne Anderson, ex officio,
 non-voting chair
 Marci Mack, recorder

Fall 2014 and Spring 2015

Ken Ruit
 Doug Munski
 Kimberly Porter
 Victor Lieberman
 Sarah Mosher
 Bruce Smith, Dean
 Robert Hill, Dean
 Nate Schroeder, Student
 Suzanne Anderson, ex officio,
 non-voting chair
 Marci Mack, recorder

III. ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES COMMITTEE REPORT FOR 2014-15

A. Petitions by type:	<u>Approved</u>	<u>Denied</u>	<u>Tabled</u>	<u>Total</u>
1. Drops after deadline	39	22	3	64
2. Grade changes	268	6	4	278
3. Change to/from S/U	7	4	0	5
4. Change to/from Credit to Audit	0	0	0	0
5. Remove "W" from record	6	10	0	16
6. Withdraw after deadline	8	20	0	28
7. Accept transfer credit	0	0	0	0
8. Grade Forgiveness	0	1	0	1
9. Repeat 1 course with another	0	0	0	0
10. Change number of credits after deadline	2	0	0	2
11. Accept credits from 2-yr. college to satisfy 60-credit requirement from 4-yr. institution	0	0	0	0
12. Change registration	0	0	0	0
13. Change credits after deadline	<u>16</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>16</u>
	340	63	7	410

B. Personal re-considerations after denials: 4 Approved, 8 Denied

C. Referred for additional information: 12

IV. A. Spring 2015 (1530) grade changes approved administratively by the Office of the Registrar for the Administrative Procedures Committee.

College of Arts and Sciences	45
School of Engineering and Mines	9
School of Law	1
College of Nursing	7
College of Business & Public Administration	12
Graduate School	3
School of Medicine	6
Center for Aerospace Sciences	10
College of Education and Human Development	3
Military Science	<u>0</u>
	96

B. Fall 2014 (1510) grade changes approved administratively by the Office of the Registrar for the Administrative Procedures Committee.

College of Arts and Sciences	9
School of Engineering and Mines	2
School of Law	0
College of Nursing	5
College of Business & Public Administration	6
Graduate School	5
School of Medicine	0
Center for Aerospace Sciences	13
College of Education & Human Development	0
Other (Military Science, Honors)	<u>1</u>
	41

C. Summer 2014 (1440) grade changes approved administratively by the Office of the Registrar for the Administrative Procedures Committee.

College of Arts and Sciences	62
School of Engineering and Mines	6
School of Law	0
College of Nursing	1
College of Business & Public Administration	12
Graduate School	3
School of Medicine	6
Center for Aerospace Sciences	9
College of Education & Human Development	8
Other (Military Science, Honors)	<u>0</u>
	107

D. Spring 2014 (1430) grade changes approved administratively by the
Office of the Registrar for the Administrative Procedures Committee.

College of Arts & Sciences	8
School of Engineering & Mines	4
School of Law	1
College of Nursing	0
College of Business & Public Administration	6
Graduate School	0
School of Medicine	1
Center for Aerospace Sciences	4
College of Education & Human Development	4
Other (Military Science, Honors)	<u>0</u>
	28

To: Lori Hofland, Administrative Assistant, Office of the Registrar

From: Janet Jedlicka, Chair, Academic Policies and Admissions Committee, 2015-2016

Re: APAC Annual Report, 2014-2015

Date: January 14, 2016

The following issues were discussed and voted upon during the 2014-2015 academic year:

Cooperative Education Policy

Approval of a new policy regarding Cooperative Education reporting guidelines as provided by the student financial aid office. The updated policy brought UND into compliance with federal financial aid.

Changing the Current Definitions

Freshman: 0-23 credits completed
Sophomore 24-59 credits completed

The rationale is that 24 credits signals needing only 12 credits per semester for the first year, and yet this rate is not adequate for a 4-year graduation. The thought was a change to something like 0-29 and 30-59 credits completed..

Follow up with other groups took place and the decision was made to table this due to NDUS and State Auditors discussion regarding proof of posted graduation date as it relates to AA/AS 60 credits to earn a degree and due to residency for tuition purposes requirements

Minimum Undergraduate Degree Credits

The committee reviewed a proposal for changing the minimum credit hours for a UND Undergraduate Degree as requested by the University senate. Discussion regarding program impacts and being able to cover content in addition to program accreditation were raised during the discussion. Questions concerning notification to the Higher Learning Commission were also discussed. More than just APAC members need to be at the table for discussion. Does the removal of credits come out of Essential Studies; they need to be at the table in this discussion. Matthew Cavalli, chair of the APAC committee for 2014/2015 responded to the university senate that there were significant concerns related to this proposals and that it would need to have various stake holders at the table. Dr. Cavalli's response was sent in August 2014 and the discussion was tabled at that point.

Good Academic Standing Policy

Committee discussed the policy of applicants must be in good standing. Look to modify the policy of those applicants academically suspended from a former institution (could be 5 years or more) but, are currently enrolled at another institution in good academic standing.

Recommendation: Students in good academic standing may apply for admission after completing 24 credits from a regionally accredited institution that they are currently attending. Students who have less than two full time semesters or less than 24 credits and who are not in good academic standing at their current institution can petition the eligibility for admission after four years of not attending an institution.

APAC would like to have the recommended modifications to the good standing policy taken to SASC to see if they would be willing to include these appeals as part of their review process in making admission decisions. If they agree then the approved policy by APAC would need to go to Senate for approval.

Academic Honors Calculation Policy

The policy was discussed regarding how academic honors were calculated. Currently the policy states that and honors GPA is based only on UND course work, and not Cum GPA. The committee determined that the current policy was reflective of the students work at UND and voted to maintain the policy of only using UND Credits.

Issue forwarded to the 2015-2016 academic year and discussed in fall 2015:

Applicants Must Submit All Transcripts Policy

A discussion surrounding Study Abroad credits related to the policy took place. It was decided that the Committee needed to collect more data.

Student Senate Resolution to decrease the credit hours required for graduation from 125 to 120. The committee has been gathering data from other institutions and stakeholders, this information will be reviewed at the February 1, 2016 meeting.

**University Senate Curriculum Committee Report
March 3, 2016**

I Program Suspension

- Tech-MS : MS in Technology

II MISC request

- To move the B.S. in Geology from the College of Arts & Sciences to the College of Engineering and Mines.

III New Course

- TECH 270 : Design Thinking
- TECH 450 : Packaging Design
- ISBC 260 : Digital Technology for Entrepreneurs
- ISBC 300: Application Development
- ISBC 497 : Practical Experience

IV Course Deletion

- TECH 112 : Graphic Design Software and Technologies II
- TECH 362 : Intermediate Graphic Design and Print Production
- ISBC 361 : Records and Information Management
- ISBC 397 : Cooperative Education

Senate Approval is not required for the following report items

V Program Changes

- Mgmt-BBA-AM : BBA with Major in Airport Management
 - Change in program requirements
- Mgmt-Minor-OSCM : Minor in Operations & Supply Chain Management
 - Change in program requirements
- Tech-BS-GDT : BS in Graphic Design Technology
 - Change in program requirements
- Tech-Minor-GDT : Minor in Graphic Design Technology
 - Change in program requirements
- EDUC-RE-MED : Master of Education in Reading Education
 - Change in program requirements
- EDUC-RE-MS : MS in Reading Education
 - Change in program requirements
- PtrE-BS : BS in Petroleum Engineering
 - Change in program requirements

- ISBE-BBA : BBA with Major in Information Systems
 - Change in program requirements
- ISBE-Minor : Minor in Information Systems
 - Change in program requirements

VI Course Changes: Undergraduate

- TECH 102: Design Software and Technologies I
 - Title change from “Graphic Design Software and Technologies I” to Digital Design Software”
 - Change in credit hours from 1-4 to 3
 - Change in repeatable for credit from “Yes” to “No”
 - Revise course description
 - Change in department from Technology to Entrepreneurship
- TECH 122 : Computer Aided Design/Drafting
 - Title change from “Computer Aided Design/Drafting” to “Computer-Aided Design”
 - Revise course description
 - Change in department from Technology to Entrepreneurship
- TECH 212 : Principles of Graphic Design and Print Production
 - Change in course title from “Principles of Graphic Design and Print Production” to “Visual Literacy”
 - Change in department from Technology to Entrepreneurship
 - Revise course description
- TECH 342: Interface Design
 - Course number change from 342 to 230
 - Change in course title from “Interface Design” to User Experience and Interface Design”
 - Change in department from Technology to Entrepreneurship
 - Revise course description
- TECH 232 : Web Design
 - Change in department from Technology to Entrepreneurship
 - Remove prerequisites
 - Revise course description
- TECH 322 : Fundamentals of Photography
 - Change in course title from “Fundamentals of Photography” to Digital Photography Fundamentals”
 - Change in department from Technology to Entrepreneurship
 - Revise course description
- TECH 422 : Digital Photography and Imaging
 - Change in course title from “Digital Photography and Imaging” to “Advanced Digital Photography and Imaging”
 - Change in department from Technology to Entrepreneurship
 - Revise course description

- TECH 332 : Industrial Design
 - Change in department from Technology to Entrepreneurship
 - Prerequisite change
- TECH 373 : Manufacturing Automation Systems
 - Change in course title from “Manufacturing Automation Systems” to Advanced Manufacturing Processes”
 - Change in department from Technology to Entrepreneurship
 - Revise course description
- TECH 442: Advanced Graphic Design and Print Production
 - Change in title from “ Advanced Graphic Design and Print Production” to “Industrial/Applied Graphic Design”
 - Change in department from Technology to Entrepreneurship
 - Prerequisite change
 - Revise course description
- TECH 451 : Computer Application Control Systems
 - Change in course title from “Computer Application Control Systems” to “Computer Integrated Manufacturing”
 - Change in department from Technology to Entrepreneurship
 - Prerequisite change
 - Revise course description
- TECH 452 : Multimedia Production
 - Change in department from Technology to Entrepreneurship
 - Remove prerequisite
 - Terms offered from Spring to On Demand
- ISBC 240 : Operating Systems Principles
 - Change in department from Information Systems and Business Communication to Entrepreneurship
- ISBC 350 : Networking II
 - Change in department from Information Systems and Business Communication to Entrepreneurship
- ISBC 430 : Database Programming
 - Change in department from Information Systems and Business Communication to Entrepreneurship
- ISBC 431 : Database Administration and Optimization
 - Change in department from Information Systems and Business Communication to Entrepreneurship
- ISBC 451 : Networking III
 - Change in department from Information Systems and Business Communication to Entrepreneurship
- ISBC 471 : Advanced Information Systems Programming

- Change in department from Information Systems and Business Communication to Entrepreneurship
- ISBC 340 : Networking I
 - Change in course title from “Networking I” to “Fundamentals of Networking”
 - Change in department from Information Systems and Business Communication to Entrepreneurship
 - Remove prerequisite
- ISBC 370 : Information Systems Programming
 - Change in course title from “Information Systems Programming” to “Web Development”
 - Prerequisite change
 - Change in department from Information Systems and Business Communication to Entrepreneurship
- ISBC 490 : Information Systems Analysis and Design Seminar
 - Prerequisite change
 - Change in department from Information Systems and Business Communication to Entrepreneurship
- EE 480 : Senior Design I
 - Terms offered: Fall
- EE 481 : Senior Design II
 - Terms offered: Spring
- PTRE 201: Introduction to Petroleum Engineering
 - Prerequisite change
- PTRE 421 : Production Engineering
 - Prerequisite change
- PTRE 461 : Natural Gas Engineering
 - Prerequisite change
- PTRE 462 : Petroleum Engineering Laboratory II
 - Prerequisite change
- PTRE 465 : Petroleum Geomechanics
 - Prerequisite change
- PTRE 484 : Senior Design
 - Prerequisite change

Nominations for Senate Committees
Committee on Committees - March 2016

For Information Only

COMMITTEE	CONTINUING MEMBERS	TERM EXPIRES (FALL)	NOMINEES	TERM EXPIRES	VOTE
1. Academic Policies & Admissions Committee			Elect 2 until 2019		
	T. Prescott (A&S)	2017	James Casler (JDO)	2019	_____
	S. Mosher (A&S)	2017	Renee Mabey (MED)	2019	_____
	A. Badahdah (A&S)	2018	Yeo Howe Lim (CEM)	2019	_____
			Hans Broedel (AS)	2019	_____
			Cai Xia Yang (CEM)	2019	_____
			Slavka Antonova (AS)	2019	_____
				2019	_____
				2019	_____
2. Administrative Procedures			Elect 2 until 2018		
	K. Porter (A&S)	2017	Paul Drechsel (JDO)	2018	_____
	A. Quinn (NUR)	2017	Peter Schumacher (JDO)	2018	_____
	J. Schill (MED)	2017	Kanishka Marasinghe (AS)	2018	_____
			Emily Cherry (AS)	2018	_____
			Doojin Hong (AS)	2018	_____
				2018	_____
				2018	_____
3. Budget, Restructuring and Reallocation			Elect 3 until 2020 (1 JDO, 1 CEM, 1 EHD)		
	M. Askim-Lovseth (BPA)	2017	Kim Kenville (JDO)	2020	_____
	T. Heitkamp (NUR)	2017	Terra Jorgenson (JDO)	2020	_____
	B. Myers (LAW)	2017	Philip Gerla (CEM)	2020	_____
	M. Gjellstad (A&S)	2018	Kathy Smart (EHD)	2020	_____
	R. Zerr (A&S)	2018		2020	_____
	J. Shabb (MED)	2018		2020	_____
				2020	_____
4. Compensation			Elect 3: 1 Tenured until 2017; 1 Tenure-Track & 1 Tenured until 2019		
	D. Lawrence (A&S) (T)	2017	Jin Lui (JDO) (T)	2017	_____
	G. Onchwari (EHD) (T)	2017	Melanie Sage (CNPD) (TT)	2017	_____
	to replace David Whalen (T)	2017	David Flynn (BPA) (T)	2017	_____
	S. Robinson (A&S) (NT)	2018	Richard Wise (AS) (T)	2019	_____
			Iraj Marnaghani (CEM) (T)	2019	_____
				2019	_____
				2019	_____
5. Conflict of Interest/Scientific Misconduct			Elect 4 until 2019 (1 JDO, 1 CEM, 1 EHD, 1 A&S-humanities/fine arts)		
	A. Bradley (A&S-soc. science)	2017	Paul Hardersen (JDO)	2019	_____
	A. Kehn (A&S-soc. science)	2017	Debra Maury (AS-humanities)	2019	_____
	E. Murphy (MED)	2017	Marcus Weaver-Hightower (EHD)	2019	_____
	S. Harken (LIB)	2018	Iraj Marnaghani (CEM)	2019	_____
	T. Clement (BPA)	2018	Leslie Martin (JDO)	2019	_____
	T. Evanson (NUR)	2018		2019	_____
				2019	_____
6. Curriculum			Elect 2 until 2019 (1 EHD & 1 NUR)		
	S. Noghianian (CEM)	2017	Katherine Terras (EHD)	2019	_____
	A. Hultquist (BPA)	2017	Desiree Tande (NURS)	2019	_____
	J. VanLooy (JDO)	2018	Steve LeMire (EHD)	2019	_____
	R. Zerr (A&S)	2018	Andrew Quinn (NURS)	2019	_____
	D. Poochigian (A&S)	2018		2019	_____
				2019	_____

COMMITTEE	CONTINUING MEMBERS	TERM EXPIRES FALL OF	NOMINEES	TERM EXPIRES	VOTE
7. Essential Studies		Elect 4 until 2019 (1 CEM, 1 MED, 1 A&S-fine arts, 1 A&S-sciences)			
	T. Hastmann (EHD)	2017	Ken Ruit (MED)	2019	_____
	L. Robison (A&S hum)	2017	Brooke Solberg (MED)	2019	_____
	A. Bradley (A&S soc sci)	2017	Alena Kubatova(AS-sciences)	2019	_____
	E. Bjerke (JDO)	2017	Evguenii Kozliak (AS-sciences)	2019	_____
	M. Jendrysik (BPA)	2018	Clement Tang (CEM)	2019	_____
	K. Flanagan (NUR)	2018	Cia Xia Yang (CEM)	2019	_____
	M. Gjellstad (A&S)	2018	Brad Reissig (AS-fine arts)	2019	_____
	D. Yearwood (BPA)	2018	_____	2019	_____
			_____	2019	_____
8. Faculty Handbook		Elect 2 until 2019 (1 Tenured, 1 Non-Tenured)			
	D. Lawrence (A&S) (T)	2017	Wesley Lawrence (AS)(NT)	2019	_____
	S. Nielsen (MED) (TT)	2018	Mark Dusenbury (JDO) (NT)	2019	_____
			Sherry Fleshman (AS) (T)	2019	_____
			Jeff Carmichael (AS) (T)	2019	_____
9. Faculty Instructional Development		Elect 2 until 2019			
	T. Knapp (A&S)	2017	Sarah Moser (AS)	2019	_____
	K. Chiasson (EHD)	2017	Chih Ming Tan (BPA)	2019	_____
	D. Gedafa (CEM)	2018	Jody Ralph (NURS)	2019	_____
	L. Martin (JDO)	2018	David Lawrence (AS)	2019	_____
			Stuart Schneider (AS)	2019	_____
			_____	2019	_____
10. Honorary Degrees		Elect 1 until 2021 (College members eligible only from CEM, A&S, LAW or NUR)			
	D. Worley (EHD)	2017	Surogit Gupta (CEM)	2021	_____
	W. Jensen (JDO)	2018	Dongmei Wang (CEM)	2021	_____
	J. Schill (MED)	2019	Elizabeth Scharf (AS)	2021	_____
	M. Jendrysik (BPA)	2020	Juodong Du (AS)	2021	_____
			Julia Ernst (LAW)	2021	_____
			Bret Weber (NURS)	2021	_____
			_____		_____
11. Honors		Elect 3 until 2019			
	A. Bradley (A&S)	2017	Surogit Gupta (CEM)	2019	_____
	S. Fleshman (A&S)	2017	Pam Kalbfleisch (AS)	2019	_____
	D. Condry (MED)	2017	Peter Meberg (AS)	2019	_____
	R. Ferraro	2018	Jason Boulanger (AS)	2019	_____
	K. Porter	2018	_____	2019	_____
	R. Rozelle-Stone	2018	_____	2019	_____
			_____	2019	_____
12. Intellectual Property		Elect 1 until 2019			
	E. Murphy (MED)	2017	Mia Park (AS)	2019	_____
	M. Askelson (JDO)	2018	Kim Porter (AS)	2019	_____
	M. Wu (MED)	2018	_____	2019	_____
			_____	2019	_____
13. Intercollegiate Athletics		Elect 3 until 2019			
	A. Cummings (A&S)	2017	Guodong Du (A&S)	2019	_____
	T. Hastmann (EHD)	2017	Kouhyar Tavakolian (CEM)	2019	_____
	J. Schill (MED)	2017	Mark Askelson (JDO)	2019	_____
	T. Heitkamp (NUR)	2017	Dongmei Wang (CEM)	2019	_____
	K. Kenville (JDO)	2017	Sally Pyle (AS)	2019	_____
	E. Murphy (MED)	2017	Cherie Graves (MED)	2019	_____
			_____	2019	_____
			_____	2019	_____

COMMITTEE	CONTINUING MEMBERS	TERM EXPIRES FALL OF	NOMINEES	TERM EXPIRES	VOTE
14. Legislative Affairs		Elect 1 until 2017 and 1 until 2019			
	D. Darland (A&S)	2017	Nancy Vogeltanz-Holm (MED)	2017	_____
	to replace Dana Harsell	2017	Rebecca Weaver-Hightower (AS)	2017	_____
	B. Weber (NUR)	2018	Katherine Rand (LAW)	2017	_____
			Jun Leiu (JDO)	2019	_____
				2019	_____
15. Library		Elect 3 until 2019 (1 CEM, 1 MED, 1 NUR)			
	E. Bjerke (JDO)	2017	Thad Rosenberger (MED)	2019	_____
	J. Haskins (BPA)	2017	Nichole Amsbaugh (MED)	2019	_____
	G. Onchwari (EHD)	2017	Gary Schindler (MED)	2019	_____
	E. Harris-Behling (A&S)	2018	Yee Han Chu (NURS)	2019	_____
	D. Haberman (LIB)	2018	Dawn Denny (NURS)	2019	_____
	M. Mikulak (A&S)	2018	Forrest Ames (CEM)	2019	_____
				2019	_____
				2019	_____
16. Online & Distance Education		Elect 6: 2 A&S, 1 CEM, 1 BPA, 1 LAW, 1 MED until 2019			
	B. Gourneau (EHD)	2017	Brent Baker (BPA)	2019	_____
	S. Laguette (JDO)	2017	Andy Hultquist (BPA)	2019	_____
	C. Harsell (NURS)	2018	Nanak Grewal (CEM)	2019	_____
		2018	Clement Tang (CEM)	2019	_____
			Heather Terrell (AS)	2019	_____
			Gregory Vandeberg (AS)	2019	_____
			Kathryn Rand (LAW)	2019	_____
			Walter Kemp (MED)	2019	_____
			Sean Degerstrom (MED)	2019	_____
				2019	_____
17. Scholarly Activities		Elect 3 until 2019 (1 NUR, 1 A&S-social science, 1 A&S-fine arts)			
	T. Desell (JDO)	2017	Vasyi Tkach (AS-social science)	2019	_____
	S. Nogharian (CEM)	2017	Elizabeth Scharf (AS-social science)	2019	_____
	M. McGinniss (LAW)	2017	Krista Minnotte (AS-social science)	2019	_____
	S. Meyers (MED)	2018	Paul Todhunter (AS-social science)	2019	_____
	C. Ozaki (EHD)	2018	Yee Han Chu (NURS)	2019	_____
	T. Clement (BPA)	2018	Nathan Rees (AS-fine arts)	2019	_____
18. Student Academic Standards		Elect 2 until 2019			
	S. Fleshman (A&S)	2017	Cai Xia Yang (CEM)	2019	_____
	K. Kenville (JDO)	2017	Nanak Grewal (CEM)	2019	_____
	K. Marasinghe (A&S)	2018	Daba Gedafa (CEM)	2019	_____
	J. Schill (MED)	2018	Marcus Weaver-Hightower (EHD)	2019	_____
			Steve LeMire (EHD)	2019	_____
			Duane Helleloid (BPA)	2019	_____
				2019	_____
				2019	_____
19. University Assessment		Elect 3 until 2019 (1 A&S, 1 NUR, 1 LAW)			
	J. Casler (JDO)	2017	Margaret Jackson (LAW)	2019	_____
	S. Gupta (CEM)	2017	Katherine Rand (LAW)	2019	_____
	D. Worley (EHD)	2018	Yee Han Chu (NURS)	2019	_____
	M. Askim-Lovseth (BPA)	2018	Andrew Quinn (NURS)	2019	_____
	D. Hanson (MED)	2018	Jeff Vaughan AS)	2019	_____
			Tim Prescott (AS)	2019	_____
			Ryan Zerr (AS)	2019	_____
				2019	_____
				2019	_____

SENATE LIBRARY COMMITTEE

- Purpose:** To provide guidance and oversight by serving in an advisory capacity to the Dean of Libraries and Information Resources regarding library policies and planning and to report to appropriate bodies on library matters.
- Membership:** Dean of Libraries or designee (one, non-voting, advisory)
Faculty (nine)
Professional librarian (one)
Students (two: one undergraduate, one graduate)
- Terms:** Dean of Libraries – concurrent with office
Faculty – three years
Professional librarian – three years
Students – one year
- Selection:** Dean of Libraries – ex-officio
Faculty – at least one member representing each college or school, approximately one-third elected by University Senate in April and assuming responsibilities May 1
Professional librarian—appointed by the Committee on Committees, in consultation with the Dean of Libraries
Undergraduate student – elected by the Student Government in April and assuming responsibilities May 1
Graduate student – appointed by the Dean of the School of Graduate Studies in consultation with the Graduate Studies Committee and the Graduate Student Association in April and assuming responsibilities May 1
- Functions and Responsibilities:** Acting on its own volition, upon the request of the Senate and /or others, the Committee shall assume the following responsibilities:
1. Participate, through the Dean of Libraries and Information Resources or persons designated by the Dean, in the formulation of broad policies relative to collections and services as well as in long-range planning.
 2. Advise the Dean in matters of administration and problem solving.
 3. Represent concerns of the University community to the Dean
 4. Report on library matters to the University Senate and other appropriate offices.
- Report to Senate:** Prepare an annual report which addresses each function and responsibility and submit it to the Senate secretary two weeks before the December Senate meeting.
- Source of Information:** University Senate Minutes – November 3, 1966
University Senate Minutes – March 5, 1981
University Senate Minutes – March 4, 1999
University Senate Minutes – November 7, 2013

UNIVERSITY of NORTH DAKOTA
RESEARCH & ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT POLICY LIBRARY
MISCONDUCT IN SCHOLARSHIP (CREATIVE ACTIVITY)

Section 1, Research
 Policy 9, Misconduct in Scholarship
 Responsible Executive: VP Research & Economic Development
 Responsible Office: VP Research & Economic Development
 Issued:
 Latest Review / Revision:



POLICY STATEMENT

1. INTRODUCTION

Scholarship is defined as all creative activity that supports the intellectual endeavors of the University of North Dakota (UND/University). The integrity of the scholarship process is an essential aspect of a university's intellectual and social structure. Although incidents of misconduct in scholarship are rare, those that do occur threaten the entire Scholarship enterprise.

The integrity of the Scholarship process must depend largely upon self-regulation. All members of the University Community, including all faculty, staff, administrators, and students, both full and part time, who are affiliated with the University, share responsibility for following the implemented standards to assure ethical conduct in scholarship, integrating these standards into their own work and reporting any abuse of the standards by others. This policy formalizes the rights and responsibilities of the University and University Community in conducting scholarship. The University is responsible for promoting practices that prevent misconduct and also for developing policies and procedures for dealing with allegations of misconduct.

It is important to create an atmosphere that encourages openness and creativity. It is particularly important to distinguish misconduct in Scholarship from the honest error and the ambiguities of interpretation that are inherent in the scholarship process. The following policies and procedures apply to faculty, staff and, in certain circumstances, students. These policies are not intended to address all academic issues of an ethical nature such as discrimination and affirmative action which are covered by other University policies.

Inquiries regarding this Policy may be directed to the Vice President for Research & Economic Development office.

REASON FOR POLICY

2. ETHICAL STANDARDS

The primary way to encourage appropriate conduct in scholarship at the University is for the University Community to promote and maintain a climate consistent with ethical standards. To reduce the likelihood of misconduct and promote high quality in scholarship, the University Community should promote and facilitate the following:

2.1. Commitment to Intellectual Honesty

This commitment to intellectual honesty is evidenced by adherence to standards of the discipline and the University including but not limited to, submission of work to peer review; avoidance of conflicts of interest fraud, and bias; scholarly exchange of ideas and data; and self-regulation.

2.2. Responsibility of Scholarship Supervisor

Supervisors of Scholarship should serve as mentors in conveying the ethics and responsibilities underlying scholarship. Mentoring relationships between academic leaders and new practitioners should serve to enhance the transmission of ethical standards.

2.3. Appropriate Assignment of Credit and Responsibility

Authors or creators should recognize the contributions of others through adequate citation and/or acknowledgment. They should also name as authors or creators only those who have had a genuine role in the scholarship and who accept responsibility for the quality of the work being reported or presented.

SCOPE OF POLICY

This policy applies to all members of the University Community and should be read by:

- | | |
|--|------------|
| ✓ President | ✓ Faculty |
| ✓ Vice Presidents | ✓ Staff |
| ✓ Deans, Directors & Department Chairs | ✓ Students |
-

CONTENTS

Policy Statement	1
Reason for Policy	1
Guiding Principles	1
Scope of Policy	2
Related Information	3
Contacts	3
Definitions	3
General Provisions	5
Procedures	6
Responsibilities	13
Notifications	13
Revision Record	13

RELATED INFORMATION

NSF Responsible Conduct of Research (RCR)	http://www.nsf.gov/bfa/dias/policy/rcr.jsp
UND Code of Conduct	http://und.edu/president/_files/docs/code-of-conduct.pdf
SBHE Officer and Employee Code of Conduct	http://ndus.edu/makers/procedures/sbhe/default.asp?PID=215&SID=4
UND Code of Student Life	http://und.edu/student-affairs/code-of-student-life/
UND Conflict of Interest Policy	http://und.edu/research/_files/docs/policy/1-8-conflict-of-interest-policy.pdf
NIH Policy Statement	http://grants.nih.gov/grants/policy/nihgps_2013/
NIH and NSF are examples, but each agency may have its own Policy.	

CONTACTS

General questions about this policy should be directed to your department’s administrative office. Specific questions should be directed to the following:

Subject	Contact	Telephone	E-Mail / Web Address
Policy and Procedure Content Clarification	Research Development & Compliance	777-4278	http://und.edu/research/resources/index/

DEFINITIONS

Allegation	
Allegation: any statement, describing possible Misconduct in scholarship, made to an institutional official.	
Committee of Investigation (CoI)	
The CoI: three member panel who gather and examine evidence during the Investigation.	
Complainant	
Complainant: individual (s) who brings an Allegation of Misconduct in scholarship.	
Counsel	
Counsel: a Support Person who is either an attorney or otherwise has legal training.	
Days	
Days: all references to Days mean business days.	
Disposition	
Disposition: the final decision of the VPAA resolving the Allegation of Misconduct in Scholarship.	
Falsification of Data	
Falsification of data: manipulating Scholarship materials, equipment, or processes, or changing or omitting data or results such that the Scholarship is not accurately represented in the Scholarship record.	
Fabrication of Data	
Fabrication: making up data or results and recording or reporting them.	

Improprieties of Authorship	
Improprieties of authorship: the improper assignment of credit, such as: excluding other authors; inclusion of individuals as authors who have not made a definite contribution to the work; or submission of multi-authored publications without the knowledge of all authors.	
Inquiry	
Inquiry: information gathering and initial fact-finding to determine whether an allegation or apparent instance of misconduct in scholarship warrants an investigation.	
Inquirer	
Inquirer: person performing an inquiry.	
Institutional Charge	
Institutional Charge: the formal charges of misconduct arising from the Inquiry.	
Integrity Officer	
Integrity Officer: person responsible to ensure compliance with this policy.	
Investigation	
Investigation: the formal examination and evaluation of all relevant facts to determine if misconduct in scholarship has occurred.	
Misappropriation of Intellectual Property	
Misappropriation of intellectual property: the unauthorized possession or use of proprietary information however obtained.	
Misconduct in Scholarship	
Misconduct in Scholarship: any form of behavior which entails scholarship fraud, scientific misconduct, negligence, misrepresentation, or an act of deception. Misconduct in Scholarship is distinguished from honest error and from ambiguities of interpretation that are inherent in the Scholarship.	
Office of Research Integrity	
Office of Research Integrity: the federal agency organized under the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, the Office of the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Office of Public Health and Science.	
Plagiarism	
Plagiarism: the misappropriation of the work of another or one's own work and its misrepresentation as one's own original work, Plagiarism does NOT require intent i.e., lack of awareness does not excuse responsibility for upholding these standards.	
Respondent	
Respondent: the person against whom an allegation of misconduct is made.	
Scholarship	
Scholarship: all creative activity that supports the intellectual endeavors of the University.	
Support Person	
Support Person: may accompany a Complainant or Respondent to the interview, but cannot be an individual who can potentially be called as a witness during the course of an Inquiry or Investigation. A Support Person may also be Counsel.	
University Community	
University Community: all faculty, staff, administrators, and students, both full and part time, who are affiliated with the University of North Dakota, and involved in Scholarship.	
VPAA	
VPAA: the Vice President for Academic Affairs or a designee.	

VPRED

VPRED: the Vice President for Research and Economic Development (VPRED) or a designee.

Witness

Witness: a person who has special knowledge relative to the Allegation and may be called during the investigation. A witness must not be a Support Person.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

1. Principles

The following principles shall guide the review of Allegations of Misconduct in Scholarship at the University:

- 1.1. The process must avoid damage to Scholarship.
- 1.2. The University will provide leadership in the pursuit and resolution of all charges.
- 1.3. Process will be provided to all parties under UND and State Board of Higher Education (SBHE/Board) policies and procedures. All parties will be fairly treated and their reputations guarded by providing confidentiality to the extent possible under UND and SBHE policies and procedures, applicable state and federal requirements, and the North Dakota Open Records Act.
- 1.4. Conflicts of interest will be avoided.
- 1.5. Allegations will be resolved as expeditiously as possible.
- 1.6. The University will document its actions at each stage of the process.
- 1.7. The University will pursue Allegations within the scope of this Policy without regard to whether related civil or criminal proceedings have been initiated. The University may, at its option, suspend the Inquiry/Investigation temporarily, but is not under obligation to do so, as the standards of the University may differ from those of the courts.
- 1.8. To the extent feasible and reasonable, the University will pursue the Allegation of Misconduct in Scholarship to its conclusion, even if the Respondent leaves or has left the University before the matter is resolved.

2. Allegations Involving Students

The Allegation must be reported to the Integrity Officer who will make the decision as to whether the complaint should be handled in accordance with the procedures as stipulated in the *Code of Student Life* or the procedures as provided in this Policy. If the decision is to proceed utilizing the *Code of Student Life* process, ~~each step of the process must be coordinated with the Integrity Officer in order to assure compliance with the procedures for timelines, decisions, and sanctions as prescribed in this Policy~~ the allegation will be forwarded to the Dean of Students or their designee.

3. Reporting Allegations of Misconduct in Scholarship

A Complainant may make Allegations of Misconduct in Scholarship, in writing or orally to any faculty member or administrator. All Allegations must then be reported to the Integrity Officer by the person who receives it.

4. Sanctions

If misconduct is found by the CoI, the VPAA may take actions and/or impose sanctions depending on the severity of the misconduct.

5. Appeal

Appeals may be made according to the procedures outlined below.

The following provisions are procedures amendable by the Conflict of Interest/Scientific Misconduct Committee as appropriate. Amendments to procedures do not require University Senate approval. However, the Conflict of Interest/Scientific Misconduct Committee shall inform the University Senate of amendments to these procedures in a timely fashion.

PROCEDURES FOR DEALING WITH ALLEGATIONS OF MISCONDUCT IN SCHOLARSHIP

1. Pre-Inquiry Review

- 1.1. Initial review by the Integrity Officer
 - 1.1.1. Upon receipt by the Integrity Officer of an Allegation of Misconduct in Scholarship, the Integrity Officer will conduct a pre-inquiry review of the Allegation within 20 days to determine whether:
 - 1.1.1.1. the Allegation is within the purview of this Policy;
 - 1.1.1.2. other policies and procedures, such as those relevant to employment grievances, should be invoked;
 - 1.1.1.3. the Allegation is outside the purview of the University;
 - 1.1.1.4. the Allegation is clearly without substance.
 - 1.1.2. If an Inquiry is determined to be unwarranted, the Integrity Officer shall prepare an internal memorandum-for-file including a statement of the Allegation and the rationale for not conducting an Inquiry. After the resolution of the Allegation of Misconduct in Scholarship this memorandum shall be kept secure pursuant to the University's records retention schedule. A copy shall be given to the VPAA, VPRED, Respondent, and Complainant.
 - 1.1.3. If an Inquiry is determined to be warranted, the Inquiry process will be initiated.
- 1.2. Notification of Respondent

Within 5 Days of the determination that an Inquiry is warranted, the Integrity Officer, shall:

 - 1.2.1. notify (Notification #1) the Respondent, the VPAA, VPRED, University's Office of General Counsel and appropriate Dean(s) of the Allegation;
 - 1.2.2. notify all parties of the procedures that will be used to examine the Allegation;
 - 1.2.3. appoint an Inquirer, who must be a tenured faculty member at the rank of associate or full professor, is without conflict of interest, and has appropriate expertise to evaluate the information relative to the case; and
 - 1.2.4. notify all parties of the proposed Inquirer and ask all parties to identify any real or potential conflict of interest between the proposed Inquirer and the parties involved in the Allegation.
- 1.3. Precautionary Actions. As the University is responsible for protecting the health and safety of Scholarship subjects, students, and staff, interim administrative action prior to conclusion of the Inquiry and, if necessary, the Investigation may be indicated. Such action ranging from slight restrictions through complete suspension of the Respondent or the Respondent's Scholarship and notification of external sponsors, if indicated, will be initiated by the VPRED in collaboration with the VPAA. Sanctions that prevent the Respondent from fulfilling his/her obligations as an employee of the University shall not be imposed during the Inquiry or Investigation phases unless

it is necessary to prevent harm to the Respondent or to others. Factors to be considered in determining the timing of such actions include the following:

- 1.3.1. There is an immediate health hazard involved;
- 1.3.2. There is an immediate need to protect federal or state funds or equipment;
- 1.3.3. There is an immediate need to protect the interests of the Complainant or Respondent as well as co-investigators and associates, if any;
- 1.3.4. It is probable that the Allegation will be reported publicly;
- 1.3.5. There is reasonable indication of possible criminal violation.

2. Inquiry Phase

2.1. Purpose

- 2.1.1. In the Inquiry phase, factual information will be gathered and expeditiously reviewed to determine whether or not a further investigation of the charge (Investigation phase) is warranted. The Inquiry phase is designed to separate Allegations deserving of further investigation from frivolous, malicious, unjustified, or clearly mistaken Allegations.

2.2. Process and Structure

- 2.2.1. The Integrity Officer will provide the Inquirer and the Respondent with copies of all relevant documents. During the Inquiry, the Integrity Officer and the Inquirer will be responsible for maintaining the confidentiality of the information obtained and the security of relevant documents. After the resolution of the Allegation of Misconduct in Scholarship, originals of all documents and related communications are to be securely maintained in the Office of the VPRED pursuant to the University's records retention schedule.
- 2.2.2. Responsibilities of the Inquirer:
 - 2.2.2.1. Records of the Inquiry are to be stored securely throughout the Inquiry and, at the end of the Inquiry, transferred to the Integrity Officer.
 - 2.2.2.2. If there is a need for interviews, the interviews must be recorded and, upon request, made available to involved parties after the completion of the Disposition Phase.
 - 2.2.2.3. Information, expert opinions, records, and other pertinent data may be requested by the Inquirer. All involved individuals are expected to cooperate with the Inquirer by supplying such requested documents and information.
 - 2.2.2.4. The Inquiry phase will be completed within 40 Days of its initiation. If the Inquirer determines that circumstances clearly warrant an extension of time, a request for such an extension must be forwarded to the Integrity Officer. If the Integrity Officer grants the request, the Inquirer will notify all relevant parties of the extension, including the VPAA, and VPRED. The record of the Inquiry will include the rationale for exceeding the 40 Day period.
 - 2.2.2.5. As the Inquiry is intended to be expeditious, individuals are expected to speak for themselves, but may be accompanied by an Advisor. If any individual chooses to bring Counsel, the University's Office of General Counsel must be notified in advance and must be present during the meeting.

2.3. Findings

- 2.3.1. The completion of an Inquiry is marked by a determination of whether or not an Investigation is warranted. The report of the Inquirer will be conveyed in writing to the Integrity Officer who will be responsible for communicating the findings to the Respondent and Complainant within 5 Days of receipt of the report in writing, by certified mail, return receipt requested. The same report will be sent to the VPAA, VPRED, Office of General Counsel, and appropriate Dean(s). The report of the Inquirer shall specify the information that was reviewed, summarize relevant interviews, and include the conclusions of the Inquiry. The Inquirer will make a recommendation to the Integrity Officer as to whether an Investigation is warranted. The Inquirer shall not recommend that an Investigation occur unless he/she concludes, based on the sufficient information for each Allegation, that the Allegation justifies an Investigation. The Respondent shall be given the opportunity to comment in writing (Notification #2) upon the findings and recommendations of the Inquirer. If the Respondent chooses to comment, such comments shall be forwarded to the Integrity Officer as soon as possible but no later than 15 Days from the date of notification of the findings by the Integrity Officer. The Respondent's comments will become part of the Inquiry record. Within 15 days of receiving the comments from the Respondent, the Integrity Officer will determine whether to proceed with an Investigation.
- 2.3.2. If the Integrity Officer determines that the Allegation was frivolous, malicious, unjustified, or clearly mistaken, and therefore, that an Investigation is unnecessary the Integrity Officer shall prepare an internal memorandum-for-file including a statement of the Allegation and the rationale for not conducting an Inquiry. After the resolution of the Allegation of Misconduct in Scholarship this memorandum shall be kept secure pursuant to the University's records retention schedule. A copy shall be given to the VPAA, VPRED, the Respondent, and the Complainant.
- 2.3.3. If the Integrity Officer determines that an Investigation should be conducted, the Integrity Officer (after notification to the appropriate Dean(s), the VPAA, VPRED and University's Office of General Counsel), will initiate the Investigation phase. The Integrity Officer must notify any sponsoring agency or funding source, including the Office of Research Integrity, if appropriate, at a time prior to the initiation of an Investigation.

2.4. Issues Unrelated to the Inquiry

- 2.4.1. If, in the course of its Inquiry, the Inquirer finds an issue unrelated to the Inquiry, the Inquirer shall inform the Integrity Officer, who may send a separate letter to the administrator who has the authority to act on the information. This unrelated issue should not be contained in the official Inquirer report nor should the letter to the administrator reveal the subject matter of the Investigation or the parties involved.

3. Investigative Phase

3.1. Purpose

- 3.1.1. An Investigation will be initiated when the Integrity Officer determines that it is necessary. The purpose of the Investigation is to examine the Institutional Charge and determine whether Misconduct in Scholarship has occurred. The Investigation will examine the factual materials of each case.

3.2. Process and Structure

- 3.2.1. After making a decision to proceed with an Investigation, the Integrity Officer will consult with the Chair of the University Senate to appoint a Committee of Investigation (CoI). No member of the CoI may have a conflict of interest. At least two members must be tenured faculty at the rank of associate or full professor and have appropriate expertise for evaluating the information relative to the case. However, if the Respondent is someone other than a faculty member of the University, one of these two members of the CoI must have a position with the University similar to that of the Respondent. The third member may be appointed from outside the University of North Dakota community if, in the judgment of the Integrity Officer, the circumstances justify such an appointment. Otherwise, the third member shall be appointed from within the University and must meet the same requirements as those listed for the first two members. The Inquirer may not serve on the CoI. Appointment of a CoI should be made within 20 Days following the decision by the Integrity Officer to proceed with an Investigation.
- 3.2.2. Before the CoI is convened, the Integrity Officer shall notify (Notification #3) all parties in writing of the Institutional Charge and of the procedures that will be used in the Investigation. Further, the parties will be informed of the proposed membership of the CoI for the purpose of identifying, in advance, any conflicts of interest.
- 3.2.3. At its first meeting, the CoI will elect a chairperson to handle procedural and administrative matters. All CoI members will be voting members.
- 3.2.4. Copies of all pertinent documents in the possession of the Integrity Officer will be provided by the Integrity Officer to the CoI and the Respondent in advance of scheduled meetings. The CoI proceedings must be recorded and, upon request, made available to the involved parties, but only after the completion of the Disposition phase.
- 3.2.5. Every effort shall be made to complete the Investigation within 80 Days. If the CoI determines that circumstances clearly warrant an extension of time, a request for such an extension must be forwarded to the Integrity Officer. If the Integrity Officer grants the request, the CoI will notify all relevant parties of the extension. The record of the Inquiry will include the rationale for exceeding the 80 Day period, along with the length of the extension.
- 3.2.6. The Integrity Officer shall convey to any affected funding agency such information about the Investigation as may be required by the funding agency, and shall keep the funding agency up to date at intervals as required by the agency.
- 3.2.7. Individuals involved may have one Support Person accompany them to the meeting with the CoI. The Support Person may not present to the CoI. If the Support Person is Counsel, the individual must notify the Integrity Officer in advance. The Integrity Officer shall notify the University's Office of General Counsel who must be present during the meeting.
- 3.2.8. The Investigation will include examination of all relevant documentation and information the CoI feels pertains to the issue. The CoI will make every attempt to interview all individuals involved, as well as other individuals who might have information regarding key aspects of the Allegations. Complete summaries of recorded interviews will be prepared, provided to the interviewed party for comment or revision, and included as part of the investigatory file. The CoI may request the involvement of outside experts. The Investigation must be sufficiently thorough to permit the CoI to reach a decision about the validity of the Allegation and the scope of the wrongdoing or to be sure that further investigation is not likely to alter an inconclusive result.
- 3.2.9. All parties in the Investigation will cooperate by producing any additional data requested. Copies of all materials secured by the CoI shall be provided to the Respondent.

- 3.2.10. The Respondent shall have an opportunity to address the charges and information in detail during his/her interview and in writing at the end of the process.
 - 3.2.11. After all information has been received and the fact-finding interviews have been completed, the CoI shall deliberate and prepare its findings. The CoI finds Misconduct in Scholarship if a majority of its members conclude beyond a reasonable doubt that the Allegation has been substantiated. A minority report may be written.
 - 3.2.12. All significant developments during the Investigation, will be reported by the Integrity Officer to any affected funding agency, sponsor, or UND official, if appropriate.
- 3.3. Findings
- 3.3.1. Upon completion of the Investigation, the CoI will submit a draft report to the Respondent by certified mail, return receipt requested. The Respondent shall be given the opportunity to comment in writing (Memo #4) upon the findings and recommendations of the CoI. If the Respondent chooses to comment, such comments shall be forwarded as soon as possible but no later than 20 Days from the date of receipt of the draft report. The Respondent's comments will be taken into consideration when completing the final report. The CoI will then submit the final report to the Integrity Officer who shall in turn transmit it to the VPAA and VPRED.
 - 3.3.2. The final CoI report must be in writing and include:
 - 3.3.2.1. Allegations. Describe the nature of the initial Allegations of Misconduct in Scholarship;
 - 3.3.2.2. Federal or state support. Describe and document federal or state support including, for example, any grant numbers, grant applications, contracts, and publications listing federal or state support;
 - 3.3.2.3. Institutional charge. Describe the specific instances of Misconduct in Scholarship that were considered in the Investigation;
 - 3.3.2.4. Policies and procedures. The institutional policies and procedures under which the Investigation was conducted shall be included;
 - 3.3.2.5. Sources of information. Identify and summarize the sources of information received whether or not reviewed;
 - 3.3.2.6. Statement of findings. For each separate Allegation of Misconduct in Scholarship identified during the Investigation, provide a finding as to whether Misconduct in Scholarship did or did not occur. For each instance of Misconduct in Scholarship that did occur:
 - 3.3.2.6.1. Identify the person(s) responsible;
 - 3.3.2.6.2. Identify the nature of the misconduct;
 - 3.3.2.6.3. Summarize the facts and the analysis of information which support the conclusion of the CoI, considering the merits of any reasonable explanations by the Respondent or other individuals who provided information;
 - 3.3.2.6.4. Identify the specific federal or state support;
 - 3.3.2.6.5. Identify whether any publications need to be corrected or retracted; and

- 3.3.2.6.6. List any current support or known applications or proposals for support that the Respondent has pending with all federal or state agencies.
- 3.3.2.7. Comments. Include and respond to comments made by the Respondent and Complainant on the draft Investigation report.
- 3.3.3. Upon request, the CoI will maintain and provide to the Office of Research Integrity (or other federal or state agencies) all relevant sources of information and records of the institution's Misconduct in Scholarship proceeding, including results of all interviews and the transcripts of recordings of such interviews.
- 3.3.4. After the resolution of the Allegation of Misconduct, all records will be maintained in the office of the VPRED by the Integrity Officer pursuant to the University's records retention schedule.
- 3.4. Issues Unrelated to the Investigation
 - 3.4.1. If, in the course of its Investigation, the CoI finds an issue unrelated to the Investigation, the CoI shall inform the Integrity Officer, who may send a separate letter to the administrator who has the authority to act on the information. This unrelated issue should not be contained in the official findings, nor should the letter to the administrator reveal the subject matter of the Investigation or the parties involved.

4. Disposition Phase

- 4.1. The VPAA shall consider the recommendations of the CoI and shall be responsible for determining and implementing any sanctions. The evaluation has two possible designated outcomes:
 - 4.1.1. If no Misconduct in Scholarship is found
 - 4.1.2. Within 10 Days of receipt of the CoI report, the VPAA shall furnish the report to the Respondent with the VPAA's decision. The VPAA shall inform the Respondent, Complainant, and the appropriate Dean that Allegations of Misconduct in Scholarship were not supported. The VPAA, through the Integrity Officer, shall inform all federal or state agencies, sponsors, or other external entities initially informed of the Investigation, that the Allegations of Misconduct in Scholarship were not supported. In determining whether to publicize the findings of no Misconduct in Scholarship, the University will be guided by whether public announcements will be harmful or beneficial in restoring any reputation(s) that may have been damaged. The Respondent's wishes will be taken into consideration when making publicity decisions. If the Allegations are deemed to have been maliciously motivated, the Inquirer or CoI will report those findings to the VPAA and a decision will be made whether to treat that finding as an Allegation of Misconduct in Scholarship against the Complainant.
- 4.2. If Misconduct in Scholarship is Found
 - 4.2.1. Within 10 Days of receipt of the report from the CoI, the VPAA shall notify the Respondent and the President, in writing, of the recommended responses, if any. A copy of the report will accompany the VPAA's decision.
 - 4.2.2. The University must respond in ways that are appropriate to the seriousness of the Misconduct in Scholarship, including, but not limited to, one or more of the following:
 - 4.2.2.1. Non-sanction
 - 4.2.2.1.1. Letter of reprimand in file.

- 4.2.2.1.2. Letter of reprimand with public notice.
- 4.2.2.2. Sanction
 - 4.2.2.2.1. Removal from particular project.
 - 4.2.2.2.2. Special monitoring of future work.
 - 4.2.2.2.3. Probation for a specified period with conditions.
 - 4.2.2.2.4. Suspension of rights and responsibilities for a specified period, with or without salary.
 - 4.2.2.2.5. Financial restitution.
 - 4.2.2.2.6. Termination of employment/enrollment.
- 4.2.3. If the sanctions involve a recommendation for termination of employment, the Respondent may use any applicable termination procedures.
- 4.2.4. The VPAA, through the Integrity Officer, is responsible for notification of all federal or state agencies, sponsors or other entities initially informed of the Investigation's outcome. Consideration should be given to formal notification of:
 - 4.2.4.1. Sponsoring agencies, funding sources.
 - 4.2.4.2. Co-authors, co-investigators, collaborators, departments.
 - 4.2.4.3. Editors of journals in which fraudulent Scholarship was published.
 - 4.2.4.4. State professional licensing boards.
 - 4.2.4.5. Editors of journals or other publications, other institutions, sponsoring agencies, and funding sources with which the individual has been affiliated.
 - 4.2.4.6. Professional societies.
- 4.3. Appeal
 - 4.3.1. Respondents who are members of the faculty of the University may appeal the sanctions to the Standing Committee on Faculty Rights (SCoFR).
 - 4.3.1.1. Under section 605.3(9) of the State Board of Higher Education (SBHE) Policies "If the administration determines that the conduct of a faculty member . . . provides reasonable cause for imposition of a sanction, the administration shall inform the faculty member in writing of the sanction and the reasons for the sanction." A faculty member may appeal to the SCoFR "[i]f the sanction is imposed without a [SCoFR] hearing . . ." The faculty member may request a SCoFR review by following the SBHE policy and the University Implementation, both of which are found in the University's Faculty Handbook.
 - 4.3.1.2. If initiated, the review of imposed sanctions by SCoFR concludes review under this Policy.

- 4.3.1.3. If the finding of Misconduct in Scholarship results in termination, Respondent may request a SCoFR review of the decision to terminate by following the SBHE policy and the University Implementation, both of which are found in the University's Faculty Handbook.
- 4.3.2. Respondents who are not members of the faculty of the University may appeal the sanctions using any applicable procedures available under state or University policies.

RESPONSIBILITIES

Individual	▪ Report Allegations of Misconduct in Scholarship to the Integrity Officer
Integrity Officer	▪ Collect, Advise, Investigate, and Monitor Allegations of Misconduct in Scholarship
VPAA	▪ Determine and Implement any Sanctions
VPRED	▪ Record Retention

NOTIFICATIONS

Notification 1	Notification of Inquiry into Professional Misconduct
Notification 2	Inquiry into Professional Misconduct
Notification 3	Notification of Investigation into Professional Misconduct
Notification 4	Investigation into Professional Misconduct

REVISION RECORD

12/7/2015- Policy Implementation	Signed by President Robert O. Kelley
---	--------------------------------------

Notification #1

Sent Certified Mail
Return Receipt Requested

To: _____, Respondent(s)

Cc: _____, Complainant

_____, proposed Inquirer

From: _____, Integrity Officer

Date: _____

Re: Notification of Inquiry into Professional Misconduct

This is to inform you that I have completed a Pre-Inquiry review of Allegations of professional misconduct brought against you by _____, and that I have determined that further inquiry into the Allegations is warranted.

The next step in the process, pursuant to the Misconduct in Scholarship Policy, is the Inquiry Phase during which factual information will be gathered and expeditiously reviewed to determine whether a further inquiry of the charge is warranted. The Inquiry Phase is designed to separate Allegations deserving of further investigation from frivolous, unjustified, or clearly mistaken Allegations.

I intend to appoint _____ to conduct an Inquiry. Within five working days of the date of this memo, everyone should inform me whether or not any real or potential conflict of interest exists between the proposed individual conducting the Inquiry and the parties involved in the Allegation. If I receive no notice of conflict of interest, the individual conducting the Inquiry, the Inquirer, will have 40 working days to complete the Inquiry, unless circumstances clearly warrant a longer period. This is a paper review based on the documentation received by the Integrity Officer and responses to questions submitted by the Inquirer to either the Complainant or Respondent for clarification. After review of all of the documentation including the written responses from the Complainant and Respondent, a determination may be made that follow-up interviews with the Complainant or Respondent may be necessary to complete the Inquiry. If the Inquirer determines that an interview is necessary, principals are expected to speak for themselves but may be accompanied by a Support Person. In case the issue is determined to need further review, do not bring an individual as an advisor who has knowledge of the issues and with whom you may want a Committee of Investigation to speak.

If you have any questions about the process, please refer to the following documents that are guiding the Inquiry:

UND Faculty Handbook, § _____ Ethical Conduct in Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity

Office of Research Integrity, US Department of Health and Human Services

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Notification #2

Sent Certified Mail
Return Receipt Requested

To: _____, Respondent

From: _____, Integrity Officer

Date: _____

Re: Inquiry into Professional Misconduct

The Inquiry concerning Allegations of professional misconduct against you has been completed. The findings of the Inquiry (support/do not support) further Investigation. Enclosed please find the report. Pursuant to the section 2.3.1 of the Misconduct in Scholarship policy, you have the opportunity to provide written comment on the findings and recommendations of the enclosed report. Your comments will become part of the record. Please send me your written comments, if any, within 15 working days from the date of this memorandum.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Enclosure

Notification #3

Sent Certified Mail
Return Receipt Requested

To: _____, Respondent

Cc: _____, Complainant

_____, Dean

_____, VPAA

_____, VPRED

_____, Office of General Counsel

_____, proposed Committee of Investigation

From: _____, Integrity Officer

Date: _____

Re: Notification of Investigation into Professional Misconduct

This is to inform you that I concur with the findings of the Inquiry that an investigation into your professional misconduct is warranted. The purpose of Investigation is to explore further the Allegations and determine whether misconduct in research and scholarship has been committed. The Investigation will focus on accusations of misconduct as defined previously and examine the factual materials of each case. In the course of the Investigation, additional information may emerge that justifies broadening the scope of the Investigation beyond the initial Allegations. You will be informed in writing if significant new directions for investigation are undertaken.

I intend to appoint _____, _____, and _____ to serve on the Committee of Investigation (CoI). Within five working days of the date of this memo, please inform me as to whether or not you have any real or potential conflict of interest between the proposed Committee of Investigation and you. Pursuant to section 3.2.5 of the Misconduct in Scholarship policy, the Committee of Investigation will have 80 working days to complete its Investigation, unless the Committee determines that circumstances clearly warrant a longer period. You may bring a Support Person; he or she may not speak with the CoI. Do not bring an individual as Support Person who has knowledge of the issue and with whom you would like the Committee to speak.

If you have any questions about the process, please refer to the following documents that are guiding the inquiry:

UND Faculty Handbook, § _____ Ethical Conduct in Research, Scholarship and Creative Activity

Office of Research Integrity, US Department of Health and Human Services

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Notification #4

Sent Certified Mail
Return Receipt Requested

To: _____, Respondent

From: _____, Chair, Committee of Investigation

Date: _____

Re: Investigation into Professional Misconduct

The Committee of Investigation has completed the investigation into the Allegation of professional misconduct against you. Enclosed please find the draft report. Pursuant to section 3.3.1 of the Misconduct in Scholarship policy, you have the opportunity to provide written comment on the findings and recommendations of the enclosed report. Please send me your written comments, if any, within 20 working days from the date of this memorandum. Your comments will be taken into consideration when finalizing the report.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Enclosure