

VI. Faculty Appeals and Grievance Procedures Sub-Policy

This sub-policy like all the other sub-policies needs to be implemented in accordance with the concepts, principles, and definitions shown in the Preamble and the General Procedures and Definitions sections from the beginning of this policy. Anyone who thinks that the policy procedures are not being followed should also read the Procedural Appeals Sub-Policy.

The university appeal process is not a legal proceeding equivalent to that of a state or federal court.

Procedures for Appeals and Grievances Except Nonreappointment and Dismissal

An appeal to the Faculty Appeals Council should be in writing to the chairperson of the Faculty Appeals Council. ~~Appeal forms are available in the offices of the vice chancellors, the president of the University Faculty Senate, and the chairperson of the Faculty Appeals Council. The documentation submitted with the appeals form shall include evidence that the problem has been discussed with the appellant's department chair and dean (or equivalent administrators). The written appeal should include (1) the name of the person appealing with telephone number and email address; (2) the parties involved in the matter about which the appeal is being made; (3) a summary of the matter, including the claims made, the decision being appealed and the reason for the appeal; (4) identification of the policy or procedure that the person appealing thinks was violated; (5) what the person appealing is seeking; and, (6) an affirmation that the matter has been discussed with the appellant's department chair and dean (or equivalent administrators) prior to filing the appeal.~~ The appellant may amend the written appeal before the beginning of the first informal hearing; thereafter, changes can be made only at the discretion of the Faculty Appeals Council. The procedures for an appeal vary according to the nature of the appeal, as indicated below.

Informal Proceedings

1. Upon receipt of the ~~appeals form~~ written notice of appeal, the chairperson of the council shall use best efforts to appoint, from the members of the council, a three-person investigative subcommittee within 10 class days of the receipt of an appeal. Both parties shall be encouraged to attempt to resolve the matter prior to the establishment of the three-person investigative subcommittee. The investigation shall be completed, if at all possible, within 15 class days from the appointment of the subcommittee. The subcommittee shall conduct its own investigation and not rely on prior reviews of the matter. Both time deadlines may be extended by ~~a two-thirds vote of the membership of the council~~ the chairperson of the Faculty Appeals Council in the interest of obtaining resolution of the matter. The investigative subcommittee shall meet with the parties to the appeal. Appeals filed between the beginning of the third week and end of the tenth week of a spring semester will be examined in Informal Proceedings, but Formal Proceedings, if necessary, normally will not occur until the following fall semester, due to the timetable outlined below. No appeals will be accepted after the end of the tenth week of the spring semester and prior to the beginning of the third week of the fall semester.

2. The investigative subcommittee shall make every effort to achieve a settlement of the grievance between the parties involved without a formal hearing. The investigators shall report to the chairperson of the council that a settlement has been reached, or if no settlement has been reached, formal proceedings shall commence if requested by the appellant.

Formal Proceedings

1. A formal proceeding will be conducted through one of the council's hearing panels, established as described in the description of the Faculty Appeals Council in the Constitution of the University Assembly of the University of Arkansas at Little Rock Faculty Senate. None of the persons who served as investigators during the informal proceedings nor any council member against whom an appeal has been filed shall participate in the deliberations of the panel, except as a witness. Additionally, those with administrative responsibilities such as Department Chairs and Associate Deans or anyone in the process of being considered for an administrative position, shall not be eligible to serve on a formal appeals panel.

2. A faculty member requesting formal appeals proceedings must notify the chair of the Faculty Appeals Council within five class days of the completion of the Informal Proceedings. Upon receipt of a written request by an appellant for the commencement of formal proceedings, the chairperson of the Faculty Appeals Council should, ~~must~~ within 10 class days of the receipt of the request, organize a formal hearing panel, informing the appellant as well as any additional individuals involved in the complaint. Either party to the appeal may object to a hearing panel member based on conflict of interest or bias. This hearing should ~~must~~ begin within 15 class days of receipt of the request for a formal hearing

3. The hearing panel shall control the procedure of the hearings as it considers appropriate including selection of a panel chairperson. All rulings and determinations of the hearing panel shall be by majority vote of the full panel including the chairperson.

- Evidence from a witness will not be accepted from a third party. Witnesses must present, either personally or through some form of synchronistic technology, or by submitting an affidavit to the hearing officer.
- The complainant and respondent must do due diligence in gathering and presenting evidence.
- Any claim by the respondent on appeal that there is new evidence must be accompanied by verification that this evidence could not have been obtained earlier.

4. The hearing and all deliberations of the hearing panel should ~~must~~ be completed within 25 ~~15~~ class days of the date of the first meeting of the hearing panel. Panel members must be present for all parts of the hearing, and the appellant and all others involved in the complaint must be given the opportunity to be present at all parts of the hearing.

5. At the close of the hearing, upon due consideration of all evidence, the hearing panel, with all members present, shall formulate its recommendation. The recommendation, including a description of the evidence relied on in making the recommendation, shall be submitted to the chancellor or other appropriate officials and to the appellant within five class days of the end of the hearing.

6. The chancellor or other appropriate official shall make known his or her decision in writing to the chairperson of the hearing panel, to the appellant, and to other involved individuals within 14 class days from receipt of the hearing panel's recommendation.

7. Time deadlines specified in these proceedings may be modified by mutual consent between the appellant and a majority of the hearing panel. The time schedule is not in operation during official University holidays, consultation day, exam days, days the University is closed due to weather, summer school, and the first two weeks of the fall semester before the Council has elected its chairperson. The term "days" refers to class days (Mondays through Fridays) during fall and spring semesters, except as otherwise noted.

Procedures for Appeals and Grievances Involving Nonreappointment

These procedures apply to non-tenured faculty members who are not offered a next successive appointment for the period following the expiration of a current appointment. The rules governing these procedures can be found in Board of Trustees Policy 405.1. The appointment of a non-tenured faculty member may be terminated effective at the end of the appointment period, at the option of either the individual or the University.

~~A chairperson, dean, or chief academic officer who decides not to recommend a non-tenured faculty member for reappointment shall notify him or her in writing in accordance with the following schedule and shall enclose a copy of this section with the letter of non-reappointment.~~

- ~~• Not later than March 1 of the first year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or at least three months in advance of its termination if the appointment terminates during the first calendar year of continuous employment.~~
- ~~• Not later than December 15 of the second year of service, if the appointment expires at the end of that year; or at least six months in advance of its termination if an appointment terminates during the second calendar year of continuous employment.~~
- ~~• At least twelve months before the expiration of the terminal appointment after two or more consecutive academic, fiscal, or calendar years in the institution. The terminal appointment will be for the academic or fiscal year, according to the appointment last held by the individual.~~

~~The individual, upon being notified that he or she will not be reappointed, may request an interview within ten working days after receipt of the notice, first with the dean of the school or college or other appropriate administrator, then, if the employee requests an interview within an additional five working days, with the chief academic officer of the campus. The dean of the school or college or other administrator and the chief academic officer jointly will within ten working days make the final decision on any request that the decision be reconsidered.~~

~~Department chairpersons and other employees on that campus may be requested to participate in their individual capacities in the interviews by the individual concerned, by the chief academic officer, or by dean or other appropriate administrator.~~

~~If the individual does not request these interviews within the time limits stated above after receipt of notification of non-reappointment, the matter shall be considered closed.~~

Procedures for Appeals and Grievances Involving Dismissal

~~These procedures, as described in Board Policy 405.1, that apply in appeals involving the dismissal of non-tenured faculty and equivalent staff members as specified in the board policy prior to expiration of appointments and to the dismissal of faculty and equivalent staff members having tenure are found in Board of Trustee Policy 405.1. The Board Policy requires each campus to specify how it will implement various aspects of the policy. Included below are only those implementation details.~~

~~1. Preliminary Proceedings: When a chairperson or dean has reason to consider a decision to dismiss a person who has tenure rights or an untenured faculty member prior to the expiration of an appointment, he or she shall discuss the matter with that person privately. After the discussion, if the decision of the chairperson or dean is to recommend dismissal, he or she shall prepare a statement of the grounds constituting the cause for dismissal and forward it through the dean's office and the vice chancellor and provost's office to the chancellor. If the faculty member requests it, a subcommittee of three faculty members of the Faculty Appeals Council shall be named by the chairman thereof to make an informal inquiry into the situation and to effect an~~

adjustment, if possible. If no settlement is effected, the subcommittee shall determine whether, in its view, formal proceedings shall be instituted to consider the individual's dismissal, and it shall notify the individual concerned, the chancellor, and other appropriate administrators of its conclusion. If the subcommittee recommends that such proceedings be begun, or if the chancellor, after considering a recommendation of the subcommittee favorable to the individual, decides that a proceeding should be undertaken, action shall be commenced according to the procedures which follow:

2. Hearing Procedures: The formal proceedings shall be initiated by a communication addressed to the individual by the chancellor informing him or her of the dismissal and the grounds for it, and that, if he or she so requests, a hearing to recommend whether his or her employment by the University shall be terminated on the grounds stated will be conducted at a specified time and place by a faculty committee constituted as described in Section 4 below. Sufficient time shall be allowed to permit the individual to prepare a defense. The individual shall be informed in detail or by reference to published regulations of the procedural rights to which he or she is entitled, including the right to advice of counsel.

The individual shall indicate whether he or she wishes a hearing and, if so, shall file with the chancellor within two weeks of the date of the mailing of the communication by the chancellor an answer to the statement of grounds for the proposed dismissal.

If the individual does not request a hearing, no further action shall be taken. Further, at the request of the individual, the proceedings provided for herein may be terminated at any time after the request for a hearing on written notice to the chancellor of the employee's acquiescence in the dismissal. Similarly, the administration may drop dismissal proceedings at any stage.

3. Suspension: Suspension of the individual from normal duties or reassignment to other duties during the proceedings will occur only if an emergency exists which threatens harm to the individual, to others, or to the University. Determination of an emergency shall be made by the chancellor in consultation with the president. Such suspension shall be with pay.

4. Hearing Panel: Upon receipt from the chancellor of a copy of the statement of grounds for dismissal, accompanied by the individual's answer thereto, *In the event that formal proceedings are initiated*, a panel to conduct the hearing and recommend a course of action shall be appointed by the chairman of the UALR Faculty Appeals Council in accordance with the procedure described in the council's charge.

It shall consist of five persons selected from the membership of the council, not including any of the three members of the subcommittee which conducted the preliminary inquiry. The hearing panel shall not include staff members of the department or administrator involved. The hearing panel shall select its own chairman.

5. Hearing Panel Proceedings: The Hearing Panel shall proceed by considering, before the time of the hearing, the statement of grounds for dismissal already formulated and the individual's written response.

In addition to the members of the hearing panel, only the person requesting the hearing and his or her representative, the chancellor and/or his or her designee, and witnesses called by the hearing panel are permitted to attend the hearing.

Charges contained in the initially formulated statement of grounds for dismissal may be supplemented at the hearing by evidence of new events occurring after the initial communication to the individual which constitute new or additional cause for dismissal. If such supplementary charges are added, the hearing panel should provide the individual with sufficient time to prepare his or her defense.

The chancellor shall have the option to attend or not to attend the hearing, and he or she may designate an appropriate representative to assist in developing and presenting the case.

The hearing panel shall determine the order of proof and shall supervise the questioning of witnesses.

The individual shall have the aid of the hearing panel when needed in securing the

~~attendance of witnesses. The individual or his or her representative and the chancellor or his or her designated representative shall have the right within reasonable limits to question all witnesses who testify orally.~~

The hearing panel will use its best efforts to provide an opportunity for those involved to confront all witnesses. *To fulfill the requirement to allow an opportunity to confront witnesses, the hearing panel will use its best efforts to allow the questioning of witnesses* either in person or through some form of synchronistic technology. In the event a witness cannot be present in one of these forms, the hearing panel will not consider any evidence the witness may have furnished that is in addition to any evidence presented by other witnesses. The hearing panel may consider the sworn affidavit of a non-present witness if the parties have been given the opportunity to question the witness either in person, using synchronistic technology, or by recorded telephone.

~~The hearing proceedings shall be duly recorded. Formal rules of court procedure need not be followed, but the hearing panel shall respond to any objections made by a party to the evidence and exercise reasonable efforts to protect the rights of the parties in the reception of evidence.~~

~~6. Consideration by Hearing Panel: The hearing panel shall formulate its recommendation in private on the basis of the hearing. Before doing so, it shall give opportunity to the individual and the chancellor or his or her designated representative to make oral statements before it. If written arguments are desired, the hearing panel may request them. The hearing panel shall proceed to arrive at its recommendation promptly without having the record of the hearing transcribed when it feels that a just decision can be reached by this means, or it may await the availability of a transcript of the hearing. It shall make explicit findings with respect to each of the grounds presented for removal.~~

~~The chancellor and the individual shall be notified of the recommendation in writing, including the findings on which the recommendation is made, and a copy of the record of the hearing shall be available to both. A copy of the record of the hearing and the recommendations of the hearing panel shall be furnished to the president of the University for his or her decision. The decision of the president shall be transmitted to the chancellor and to the individual involved.~~

~~7. Consideration by Board of Trustees: If the decision of the president is appealed to the Board of Trustees, or if the Board of Trustees chooses to review the case, the president shall transmit to the Board of Trustees the full report of the hearing panel, including its recommendations, and his or her decision. The review shall be based on the record of the previous hearing, accompanied by opportunity for argument, oral or written or both, by the principals at the hearing or by their representatives. The decision of the Board of Trustees on review shall be final. It shall be communicated to the president and through him or her to the person involved.~~

Definitions of terms

Tenure. Tenure is the right of continuous appointment. It is awarded by the president to eligible members of the faculty upon successful completion by each of a probationary period and, once granted, it ceases to exist only by dismissal for cause according to the procedures in Section IV.C., demonstrably bona fide financial exigency, reduction or elimination of programs, retirement, or resignation. "Cause" is defined as conduct which demonstrates that the faculty member lacks the ability or willingness to perform his or her duties or to fulfill his or her responsibilities to the university; examples of such conduct include (but are not limited to) incompetence, neglect of duty, intellectual dishonesty, termination based on Post-Tenure Review Policy, and moral turpitude.

IX. Policies and Procedures for Dealing with Misconduct in Research, Teaching and Service Sub-Policy

This sub-policy like all the other sub-policies needs to be implemented in accordance with the concepts, principles, and definitions shown in the Preamble and the General Procedures and Definitions sections from the beginning of this policy. Anyone who thinks that the policy procedures are not being followed should also read the Procedural Appeals Sub-Policy.

Introduction

General Policy

The basic principle in the conduct of scholarly activity rests on objective inquiry and the pursuit of truth. Integrity in the conduct of scholarly activity is essential and must be maintained.

Although instances of misconduct are rare, it is acknowledged that they do occur. Once they do occur, they present a serious threat to continued public confidence in the integrity of the scholarship and the stewardship of funds which support the scholarly activity.

This Policy provides the basis for uniform procedures for dealing with instances of alleged or apparent misconduct, as the term is defined herein, and the responsibilities for such actions.

This Policy is written and approved in accordance with Public Health Service regulation 42CFR Part 50, Subpart A.

Scope

This policy applies to all individuals at University of Arkansas at Little Rock paid by, under the control of, or affiliated with the institution, including faculty, administrators, scientists, trainees, technicians and other staff members, students, fellows, guest researchers, or collaborators at University of Arkansas at Little Rock.

This policy neither limits nor supersedes the Academic Integrity Sub-Policy.

Definitions

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

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

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

D. Conflict of interest means real or apparent bias due to prior or existing personal or professional relationships.

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

F. Inquiry means gathering information and initial fact-finding to determine whether an allegation or apparent instance of misconduct warrants an investigation.

G. Integrity Officer means the University of Arkansas at Little Rock official responsible for assessing allegations of misconduct and determining when such allegations warrant inquiries and overseeing inquiries and investigations.

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

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

J. Retaliation means any action that adversely affects the employment or other institutional status of an individual that is taken by University of Arkansas at Little Rock or an employee because the individual has, in good faith, made an allegation of misconduct or has cooperated in good faith with an investigation of such allegation, or inadequate institutional response thereto.

K. Misconduct means fabrication, falsification, plagiarism, or other practices that seriously deviate from those that are commonly accepted within the scholarly community for proposing, conducting, or reporting scholarly activity. It does not include honest error or honest differences in interpretations or judgments of data. It also means helping others engage in misconduct including helping students violate the Academic Integrity Sub-Policy.

Rights and Responsibilities

A. Integrity Officer

The Chancellor will appoint the Integrity Officer who will have primary responsibility for implementation of the procedures set forth in this document. The Chancellor shall circulate the name and vitae of the person the Chancellor chooses to appoint as the Integrity Officer for 5 weeks days inviting comment on the selection.

The Integrity Officer will be a University of Arkansas at Little Rock official who is well qualified to handle the procedural requirements involved and is sensitive to the varied demands made on those who conduct scholarly activities, those who are accused of misconduct, and those who report apparent misconduct in good faith.

The Integrity Officer receives complaints of research misconduct defined as fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting research results.

- (a) Fabrication is making up data or results and recording or reporting them.
- (b) Falsification is manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes, or changing or omitting data or results such that the research is not accurately represented in the research record.
- (c) Plagiarism is the appropriation of another person's ideas, processes, results, or words without giving appropriate credit

The Integrity Officer will preside over the inquiry and investigation committees and ensure that necessary and appropriate expertise is secured to carry out a thorough and authoritative evaluation of the relevant evidence in an inquiry or investigation. The Integrity Officer will attempt to ensure that confidentiality is maintained.

The Integrity Officer will assist inquiry and investigation committees and all University of Arkansas at Little Rock personnel in complying with this policy and with applicable standards imposed by government or external funding sources. The Integrity Officer is also responsible for maintaining files of all documents and evidence and for the confidentiality and the security of the files.

If a sponsored project is involved, the Integrity Officer will report to the Funding Agency and keep the Funding Agency apprised of any developments during the course of the inquiry or investigation that may affect current or potential sponsored funding for the individual(s) under investigation or that the Funding Agency the needs to know to ensure appropriate use of external funds and otherwise protect the public interest.

B. Complainant

The complainant will have an opportunity to testify before the inquiry and investigation committees, to review portions of the inquiry and investigation reports pertinent to his/her allegations or testimony, to be informed of the results of the inquiry and investigation, and to be protected from retaliation. Also if the Integrity Officer has determined that the complainant may be able to provide pertinent information on any portions of the draft report, these portions may be given to the complainant for comment.

The complainant's is responsible for making allegations in good faith, maintaining confidentiality, and cooperating with an inquiry or investigation.

C. Respondent

The respondent will be informed of the allegations when an inquiry is opened and notified in writing of the final determinations and resulting actions. The respondent also will have the right to be interviewed by and present evidence to the inquiry and investigation committees, to review the draft inquiry and investigation reports, and to have the advice of legal counsel employed at his or her own expense.

The respondent is responsible for maintaining confidentiality and cooperating with the conduct of an inquiry or investigation. If the respondent is not found guilty of misconduct, he or she has the right to receive institutional assistance in restoring his or her reputation.

D. Deciding Official

The Chancellor will receive the inquiry and/or investigation report and any written comments made by the respondent or the complainant on the draft report. The Chancellor will consult with the Integrity Officer or other appropriate officials and will determine whether to conduct an investigation, whether misconduct occurred, whether to impose sanctions, or whether to take other appropriate administrative actions as shown in the Institutional Administrative Actions section of this sub-policy.

General Policies and Principles

A. Responsibility to Report Misconduct

All employees or individuals associated with University of Arkansas at Little Rock should report observed, suspected, or apparent misconduct in scholarly activities to the Integrity Officer or Chancellor. If an individual is unsure whether a suspected incident falls within the definition of misconduct, he or she may call the Integrity Officer to discuss the suspected misconduct informally. If the circumstances described by the individual do not meet the definition of misconduct, the Integrity Officer will refer the individual or allegation to other offices or officials with responsibility for resolving the problem.

At any time, an employee may have confidential discussions and consultations about concerns of possible misconduct with the Integrity Officer and will be counseled about appropriate procedures for reporting allegations.

B. Protecting the Complainant

The Integrity Officer will monitor the treatment of individuals who bring allegations of misconduct or of inadequate institutional response thereto, and those who cooperate in inquiries or investigations. The Integrity Officer will ensure that these persons will not be retaliated against in the

terms and conditions of their employment or other status at the institution and will review instances of alleged retaliation for appropriate action.

Employees should immediately report any alleged or apparent retaliation to the Integrity Officer.

University of Arkansas at Little Rock will protect the privacy of those who report misconduct in good faith to the maximum extent possible. For example, if the complainant requests anonymity, University of Arkansas at Little Rock will make an effort to honor the request during the allegation assessment or inquiry within applicable policies and regulations, and state and local laws, if any. The complainant will be advised that if the matter is referred to an investigation committee and the complainant's testimony is required, anonymity may not be possible. University of Arkansas at Little Rock will undertake diligent efforts to protect the positions and reputations of those persons who, in good faith, make allegations.

C. Protecting the Respondent

Inquiries and investigations will be conducted in a manner that will ensure fair treatment to the respondent(s) in the inquiry or investigation and confidentiality to the extent possible without compromising public health and safety or thoroughly carrying out the inquiry or investigation.

D. Cooperation with Inquiries and Investigations

University of Arkansas at Little Rock employees will cooperate with the Integrity Officer and other University of Arkansas at Little Rock officials in the review of allegations and the conduct of inquiries and investigations. Employees have an obligation to provide relevant evidence to the Integrity Officer or other University of Arkansas at Little Rock officials on misconduct allegations.

E. Preliminary Assessment of Allegations

Upon receiving an allegation of misconduct, the Integrity Officer will immediately assess the allegation to determine whether there is sufficient evidence to warrant an inquiry, and whether the allegation falls under the University of Arkansas at Little Rock definition of misconduct.

Conducting the Inquiry

A. Initiation and Purpose of the Inquiry

If the Integrity Officer determines that the allegation provides sufficient information to warrant specific follow-up and falls under the definition of misconduct, the Integrity Officer shall attempt to resolve the complaint informally, prior to beginning the official inquiry process. Any informal resolution shall be documented. If the Integrity Officer is unable to resolve the complaint information, he or she immediately will initiate the inquiry process. In initiating the inquiry, the Integrity Officer should clearly identify the original allegation and any related issues that should be evaluated. The purpose of the inquiry is to make a preliminary evaluation of the available evidence and testimony of the respondent, complainant, and key witnesses to determine whether there is sufficient evidence of possible misconduct to warrant an investigation. If evidence is available from an academic integrity case, the Dean of Students will supply the Integrity Officer with the evidence. Care will be taken to restrict the information to only those who need the evidence for the inquiry. The purpose of the inquiry is **not** not to reach a final conclusion about whether misconduct definitely occurred or who was responsible. The findings of the inquiry must be set forth in an inquiry report. An Inquiry Committee shall be appointed as provided for herein.

B. Sequestration of the Activity Records

After determining that an allegation falls within the definition of misconduct, the Integrity Officer must ensure that all original activity records and materials relevant to the allegation are immediately secured. This sequestration should occur before the respondent is notified of the inquiry.

C. Appointment of the Inquiry Committee

The Inquiry Committee shall be constituted with 30 days after the Integrity Officer determines that the matter cannot be resolved informally. The Committee shall be composed of three people with knowledge of research methodology/subject area of complaint. The respondent shall recommend three people to serve on the committee, one of whom the Integrity Officer will select. The complainant cannot be a member of the Inquiry Committee. No subordinate of the respondent shall serve. Every attempt shall be made to have diverse departments/colleges on the Inquiry Committee. The Inquiry Committee shall be empowered to solicit the opinions of outside experts when the committee views this as needed.

The Integrity Officer will notify the respondent of the inquiry and the members of the Inquiry Committee. If the respondent submits a written objection to any member of the Inquiry Committee based on bias or conflict of interest within 5 days, the Integrity Officer will determine whether to replace the challenged member with a qualified substitute.

D. Charge to the Committee and the First Meeting

The Integrity Officer will prepare a charge for the Inquiry Committee that describes the allegations and any related issues identified during the allegation assessment and states that the purpose of the inquiry is to make a preliminary evaluation of the evidence and testimony of the respondent, complainant, and key witnesses to determine whether there is sufficient evidence of possible misconduct to warrant an investigation. The purpose is not to determine whether misconduct definitely occurred or who was responsible.

At the committee's first meeting, the Integrity Officer will review the charge with the committee, discuss the allegations, any related issues, and the appropriate procedures for conducting the inquiry, assist the committee with organizing plans for the inquiry, and answer any questions raised by the committee. The Integrity Officer will be present throughout the inquiry to advise the committee as needed. Institutional legal counsel will be available to advise the committee if needed.

E. Inquiry Process

The Inquiry Committee normally will interview the complainant, the respondent, and key witnesses, as well as examine relevant activity records and materials. The Inquiry Committee then will evaluate the evidence and testimony obtained during the inquiry. After consultation with the Integrity Officer and institutional legal counsel (if deemed appropriate), the committee members will decide whether there is sufficient evidence of possible misconduct to recommend further investigation.

The Inquiry Report

A. Elements of the Inquiry Report

A written inquiry report shall be prepared that states the name and position of the committee members and experts, if any; the allegations; a summary of the inquiry process used; a list of the activity records reviewed; summaries of any interviews; a description of the evidence in sufficient detail to demonstrate whether an investigation is recommended and whether any other actions

should be taken if an investigation is not recommended. Institutional legal counsel may review the report for legal sufficiency.

B. Comments on the Draft Report by the Respondent and the Complainant

The Integrity Officer will provide the respondent with a copy of the draft inquiry report for comment and rebuttal and will provide the complainant, if he or she is identifiable, with the portions of the draft inquiry report that address the complainant's role and opinions of the investigation.

1. Confidentiality

The Integrity Officer may establish reasonable conditions for review to protect the confidentiality of the draft report.

2. Receipt of Comments

Within 5 calendar days of their receipt of the draft report, the complainant and respondent will provide their comments, if any, to the inquiry committee. Any comments that the complainant or respondent submits on the draft report will become part of the inquiry report and record.

Based on the comments, the inquiry committee may revise the report as appropriate.

C. Inquiry Decision and Notification

1. Decision by Deciding Official

The Integrity Officer will transmit the final report and any comments to the Provost (Deciding Official), who will make the determination of whether findings from the inquiry provide sufficient evidence of possible misconduct to justify conducting an investigation. The respondent has the right to request the Provost overrule the findings of the Inquiry Committee. The inquiry is completed when the Provost makes this determination, which will be made within 75 days of the first meeting of the Inquiry Committee. Any extension of this period will be based on good cause and recorded in the inquiry file.

2. Notification

The Integrity Officer will notify both the respondent and the complainant in writing of the Provost's decision of whether to proceed to an investigation and will remind them of the obligation to cooperate in the event an investigation is opened. The Integrity Officer will also notify all appropriate University of Arkansas at Little Rock officials of the Provost's decision.

D. Time Limit for Completing the Inquiry Report

The inquiry committee will normally complete the inquiry and submit its report in writing to the Integrity Officer no more than 60 calendar days following its first meeting. This includes conducting the inquiry, obtaining comments from the respondent and complainant, and submitting the report to the Provost through the Integrity Officer.

Conducting the Investigation

A. Purpose of the Investigation

The purpose of the investigation is to explore in detail the allegations, to examine the evidence in depth, and to determine specifically whether misconduct has been committed, by whom, and to what extent. The investigation will also determine whether there are additional instances of possible misconduct that would justify broadening the scope beyond the initial allegations. This is particularly important where the alleged misconduct involves clinical trials or potential harm to human subjects or the general public or if it affects activity that forms the basis for public policy, clinical practice, or public health practice. The findings of the investigation will be included in an investigation report.

B. Sequestration of the Activity Records

The Integrity Officer will immediately sequester any additional pertinent activity records that were not previously sequestered during the inquiry. This sequestration should occur before or at the time the respondent is notified that an investigation has begun. The procedures to be followed for sequestration during the investigation are the same procedures that apply during the inquiry.

C. Appointment of the Investigation Committee

The Chancellor shall appoint three tenured faculty members, who he/she deems to have appropriate expertise to assure a sound knowledge base from which to work, to the Misconduct in Scholarship Investigation Committee. The Chancellor can appoint additional members to the Investigation Committee if certain knowledge or experience is desired.

The Integrity Officer will notify the respondent of the proposed committee membership within 5 days of initiation of the investigation. If the respondent submits a written objection to any appointed member of the investigation committee within 5 days of receipt of such notification, the Integrity Officer will determine whether to replace the challenged member with a qualified substitute.

D. Charge to the Committee and the First Meeting

1. Charge to the Committee

The Integrity Officer will define the subject matter of the investigation in a written charge to the committee that describes the allegations and related issues identified during the inquiry, defines misconduct, and identifies the name of the respondent. The charge will state that the committee is to evaluate the evidence and testimony of the respondent, complainant, and key witnesses to determine whether, based on a preponderance of the evidence, misconduct occurred and, if so, to what extent, who was responsible, and its seriousness.

During the investigation, if additional information becomes available that substantially changes the subject matter of the investigation or would suggest additional respondents, the committee will notify the Integrity Officer, who will determine whether it is necessary to notify the respondent of the new subject matter or to provide notice to additional respondents.

2. The First Meeting

The Integrity Officer will convene the first meeting of the Investigation Committee to review the charge, the inquiry report, and the prescribed procedures and standards for the conduct of the investigation, including the necessity for confidentiality and for developing a specific investigation. The Integrity Officer may seek the assistance of institutional legal counsel in conducting these duties. The Investigation Committee will be provided with a copy of the instructions.

E. Investigation Process

The Investigation Committee will be appointed and the process initiated within 30 days of the completion of the inquiry.

The investigation normally will involve examination of all documentation including, but not necessarily limited to, relevant activity records, computer files, proposals, manuscripts, publications, correspondence, memoranda, and notes of telephone calls. Whenever possible, the committee should interview the complainant(s), the respondent(s), and other individuals who might have information regarding aspects of the allegations. Interviews of the respondent should be tape recorded or transcribed. All other interviews should be transcribed, tape recorded, or summarized. Summaries or transcripts of the interviews should be prepared,

provided to the interviewed party for content or revision, and included as part of the investigative file.

The Investigation Report

A. Elements of the Investigation Report

The final report submitted to the Chancellor must describe how and from whom information relevant to the investigation was obtained, state the findings, and explain the basis for the findings. The report will include the actual text or an accurate summary of the views of any individual(s) found to have engaged in misconduct.

B. Comments on the Draft Report

1. Respondent

The Integrity Officer will provide the respondent with a copy of the draft investigation report for comment and rebuttal. The respondent will be allowed 15 calendar days to review and comment on the draft report. The respondent's comments will be attached to the final report. The findings of the final report should take into account the respondent's comments in addition to all the other evidence.

2. Complainant

The Integrity Officer will provide the complainant with those portions of the draft investigation report that address the complainant's role and opinions in the investigation. The complainant will be allowed 15 calendar days to review and comment on the draft report. The complainant's comments will be attached to the final report. The findings of the final report should be modified, as appropriate, based on the complainant's comments.

3. Institutional Legal Counsel

The draft investigation report will be transmitted to the institutional legal counsel for a review of its legal sufficiency. Comments should be incorporated into the report as appropriate.

4. Confidentiality

In distributing the draft report, or portions thereof, to the respondent and complainant, the Integrity Officer will inform the recipient of the confidentiality under which the draft report is made available and may establish reasonable conditions to ensure such confidentiality. For example, the Integrity Officer may request the recipient to sign a confidentiality statement or to come to his or her office to review the report.

C. Institutional Review and Decision

Based on a preponderance of the evidence, the Chancellor will make the final determination of whether to accept the investigation report, its findings, and the recommended institutional actions. If this determination varies from that of the Investigation Committee, the Chancellor will submit to the Investigation Committee a written explanation detailing the basis for rendering a decision different from that of the Investigation Committee. The Chancellor's explanation should be consistent with the Institution's definition of misconduct, the Institution's policies and procedures, and the evidence reviewed and analyzed by the Investigation Committee. The Chancellor also may return the report to the Investigation Committee with a request for further fact-finding or analysis. The Chancellor's determination, together with the Investigation Committee's report, constitutes the final investigation report for purposes of Funding Agency review. If the activity is externally funded, the Chancellor will explain any variance in his/her final determination in the final investigation letter transmitting the report to the Funding Agency.

When a final decision on the case has been reached, the Integrity Officer will notify both the respondent and the complainant in writing. In addition, the Chancellor will determine whether law enforcement agencies, professional societies, professional licensing boards, editors of journals in which falsified reports may have been published, collaborators of the respondent in the work, or other relevant parties should be notified of the outcome of the case. The Integrity Officer is responsible for ensuring compliance with all notification requirements of funding agencies.

D. Transmittal of the Final Investigation Report to Funding Agency

After comments have been received and the necessary changes have been made to the draft report, the Investigation Committee should transmit the final report with attachments, including the respondent's and complainant's comments, to the Funding Agency, through the Integrity Officer.

E. Time Limit for Completing the Investigation Report

An investigation ordinarily should be completed within 120 calendar days of its initiation, with the initiation being defined as the first meeting of the Investigation Committee. This includes conducting the investigation, preparing the report of findings, making the draft report available to the subject of the investigation for comment, submitting the report to the Chancellor for approval, and submitting the report to the Funding Agency.

Requirements for Reporting to the Funding Agency

A. The University of Arkansas at Little Rock's decision to initiate an investigation must be reported in writing to the Funding Agency, on or before the date the investigation begins. At a minimum, the notification should include the name of the person(s) against whom the allegations have been made, the general nature of the allegation as it relates to the funding agency definition of misconduct, and the application or grant number(s) involved. The Funding Agency must also be notified of the final outcome of the investigation and must be provided with a copy of the investigation report. Any significant variations from the provisions of the institutional policies and procedures should be explained in any reports submitted to the Funding Agency.

B. If the University of Arkansas at Little Rock plans to terminate an inquiry or investigation for any reason without completing all relevant requirements of this policy, the Integrity Officer will submit a report of the planned termination to the Funding Agency, including a description of the reasons for the proposed termination.

C. If the University of Arkansas at Little Rock determines that it will not be able to complete the investigation in 120 calendar days, the Integrity Officer will submit a written explanation which describes reasons for the delay, reports on the progress to date, estimates the date of completion of the report, and describes other necessary steps to be taken.

D. When Public Health Service (PHS) funding or applications for funding are involved, and an admission or finding of misconduct is made, the Integrity Officer will contact the Office of Research Integrity (ORI) for consultation and advice. Normally, the individual making the admission will be asked to sign a statement attesting to the occurrence and extent of misconduct. When the case involves PHS funds, the University of Arkansas at Little Rock cannot accept an admission of misconduct as a basis for closing a case or not undertaking an investigation without prior approval from the ORI.

E. The Integrity Officer will notify the Funding Agency at any stage of the inquiry or investigation

1. There is an immediate health hazard involved;
2. There is an immediate need to protect external funds or equipment;

3. There is an immediate need to protect the interests of the person(s) making the allegations or of the individual(s) who is the subject of the allegations as well as his/her co-investigators and associates, if any;

4. It is probable that the alleged incident is going to be reported publicly;

5. The allegation involves a public health sensitive issue, e.g. a clinical trial;

6. There is a reasonable indication of possible criminal violation. In this instance, the institution must inform the Funding Agency within 24 hours of obtaining that information.

Institutional Administrative Actions

The University of Arkansas at Little Rock will take appropriate administrative actions against individuals when an allegation of misconduct has been substantiated.

If the Chancellor determines that the alleged misconduct is substantiated by the findings, he or she will decide on the appropriate actions to be taken, after consultation with the Integrity Officer. The actions include:

- informing in writing the agency (if any) sponsoring the activity;
- informing in writing the University of Arkansas Board of Trustees;
- recommending to the President appropriate administrative action as provided for in the policies and procedures of the University;
- withdrawal or correction of all pending or published abstracts and papers emanating from the activity where misconduct was found;
- restitution of funds as appropriate; and
- other action deemed appropriate by the Chancellor.

Other Considerations

A. Termination of Institutional Employment or Resignation Prior to Completing Inquiry or Investigation

In the case of externally sponsored activities, the termination of the respondent's institutional employment, by resignation or otherwise, before or after an allegation of possible misconduct has been reported, will not preclude or terminate misconduct procedures outlined in this Policy. If the respondent without admitting to the misconduct, elects to resign his or her position prior to the initiation of an inquiry, but after an allegation has been reported, or during an inquiry or investigation, the inquiry or investigation will proceed. If the respondent refuses to participate in the process after resignation, the committee will use its best efforts to reach a conclusion concerning the allegations, noting in its report the respondent's failure to cooperate and its effect on the committee's review of all the evidence.

B. Restoration of the Respondent's Reputation

If the University of Arkansas at Little Rock finds no misconduct after consulting with the respondent, the Integrity Officer will undertake reasonable efforts to restore the respondent's reputation. Depending on the particular circumstances, the Integrity Officer should consider notifying those individuals aware of or involved in the investigation of the outcome, publicizing

the final outcome in forums in which the allegation of misconduct was previously publicized, or expunging all reference to the misconduct allegation from the respondent's personnel file.

C. Protection of the Complainant and Others

Regardless of whether the institution determines that scientific misconduct occurred, the Integrity Officer will undertake reasonable efforts to protect complainants who made allegations of misconduct in good faith and others who cooperate in good faith with inquiries and investigations of such allegations. Upon completion of an investigation, the Chancellor will determine, after consulting with the complainant, what steps, if any, are needed to restore the position or reputation of the complainant. The Integrity Officer is responsible for implementing any steps the Chancellor approves. The Integrity Officer also will take appropriate steps during the inquiry and investigation to prevent any retaliation against the complainant. The University follows the Public Health Service Office of Research Integrity's "Guidelines for Responding to Possible Retaliation Against Whistleblowers in Extramural Research."

D. Allegations Not Made in Good Faith

If relevant, the Chancellor will determine whether the complainant's allegations of misconduct were made in good faith. If an allegation was not made in good faith, the Chancellor will determine whether any administrative action should be taken against the complainant as provided for in the policies and procedures of the University.

E. Interim Administrative Actions

Institutional officials will take interim administrative actions, as appropriate, to protect external funds and ensure that the purposes of the external financial assistance are carried out.

Record Retention

After completion of a case and all ensuing related actions, the Integrity Officer will prepare a complete file, including the records of any inquiry or investigation and copies of all documents and other materials furnished to the Integrity Officer or committees. The Integrity Officer will keep the file for five years after completion of the case. The Funding Agency or other authorized Office of Research Integrity personnel will be given access to the records upon request.

X. Grievance Procedures –Complaints of Discrimination Involving Faculty Sub-Policy

This sub-policy like all the other sub-policies needs to be implemented in accordance with the concepts, principles, and definitions shown in the Preamble and the General Procedures and Definitions sections from the beginning of this policy. Anyone who thinks that the policy procedures are not being followed should also read the Procedural Appeals Sub-Policy. For information regarding the university's nondiscrimination policies, see the Faculty Handbook.

Introduction

UALR Goal to Eliminate Discrimination

It is the goal of UALR to eliminate discriminatory harassment and to promote equal

opportunity regardless of race, gender, color, national origin, religion, sexual orientation, age, veteran's status, or disability. Any individual, whether faculty, staff or student, who believes he/she has been discriminated against should not be deterred from reporting his/her allegations.

The procedure for filing a complaint described below is internal to the University and everyone is encouraged to follow it first *before filing a complaint with the federal or state government*. Any individual, however, also has the right to file a formal complaint with the appropriate state or federal agency.

Offices Hearing Complaints

The Human Resources Officer has the responsibility for UALR's compliance with non-discriminatory laws and regulations. The Officer receives informal or formal complaints lodged against faculty, staff, and administration. The Human Resources Officer may be requested by the Chancellor, Provost, Vice Chancellors, or Deans to conduct an investigation without formal charges being brought.

The Office of the Dean of Students has responsibility to hear grievances brought by one student against another student. The Dean of Students may consult with the Human Resources Officer for assistance in negotiating or resolving complaints.

Additionally, complaints may be referred to one's supervisor.

Employee Responsibilities

All employees or inhabitants of the University have the responsibility to inform the Human Resources Officer of all allegations of discrimination which have been reported to them or of which they are aware.

Retaliation is Illegal

It is expressly forbidden, and illegal, for anyone to retaliate against an individual for bringing a complaint of discrimination or denial of equal opportunity.

Reporting Guidelines

Complaints of discrimination, either formal or informal, should be filed within 30 ~~working~~ days of the ~~event~~ *alleged act or pattern of behavior that led complainant to believe the respondent engaged in discrimination*. Filing a complaint with one's supervisor, the Dean of Students, or the Human Resources Officer satisfies the requirements for reporting. In extenuating circumstances, the time limit may be waived by the Human Resources Officer or the Dean of Students. The written request with a copy of notification of approval will be placed in the file.

Informal Complaint Procedures

An informal complaint does not result in disciplinary action. Informal complaints may be discussed with the Human Resources Officer or the Dean of Students.

If the goal is merely to seek advice, the University official will attempt to assist with the resolution of the problem but will refrain from drawing a conclusion as to whether discrimination has occurred. The hearing official may talk to the "other" person in an effort to resolve the problem. A written record of the complaint will be made and will be filed with the Human Resources Officer. The supervisors of the individual filing the complaint and the person against whom the complaint is filed will be notified. The subject of the complaint will be given the opportunity to enter a response into the file. If the issue is resolved, no further action will be taken, and all parties previously informed will be notified of the outcome.

Unresolved informal complaints might require the greater involvement of supervisors or the Human Resources Officer.

The fundamental goal of the informal complaint procedure is to involve the fewest number of people needed to resolve an issue at the lowest level.

Formal Complaint Procedures

Formal complaints of discrimination or denial of equal opportunity should be submitted to the Human Resources Officer within 180 days of the alleged act or pattern of behavior that led complainant to believe the respondent engaged in discrimination. Complaints involving students are submitted to the Dean of Students.

1. A copy of the complaint together with a copy of these procedures will be presented to the individual against whom the complaint is filed. The individual will have 10 ~~business~~ days from the time of receipt of the complaint to respond.
2. The Human Resources Officer will convene an initial hearing involving the complainant, the alleged offender, and the alleged offender's supervisor/chair to discuss the charges and attempt to informally mediate a resolution. A record of the meeting will be kept. If the issue is resolved, the Human Resources Officer will present a report to the Chancellor. If the issue is not resolved, the Human Resources Officer shall convene a hearing committee composed of three people, one of whom shall be a tenured faculty member. The complainant and respondent may each recommend one member to serve on the hearing committee. Unless a conflict of interest or an appearance of conflict of interest, the recommendations by the complainant and respondent shall be accepted.
3. If the formal review process exceeds 30 ~~calendar~~ days, the complainant will be informed of the need for additional time, the status of the investigation, and revised deadline for completion of the investigation.
4. If during the course of its investigation, the hearing panel determines the charges are frivolous or without merit, it may dismiss the complaint, notify all parties in writing of its action, and notify the Chancellor.
5. If the complaint is found to have merit, the hearing committee shall recommend sanctions to the ~~chair of the department who shall impose one or more of the recommended sanctions~~ Human Resource Officer. *If sanctions are recommended, the Human Resource Officer shall share the recommended sanctions with the department chair, complainant and respondent, impose the sanction, other than dismissal, and resolve the conflict.* If the sanction recommended is dismissal, that recommendation shall be made to the Chancellor. If the complaint is found not to have merit, the Hearing Committee shall recommend dismissal of the complaint to the Human Resource Officer and notify the parties and the Chancellor.
6. ~~If sanctions are recommended, the Human Resource Officer shall share the recommended sanctions with the department chair, complainant and respondent, impose the sanction, other than dismissal, and resolve the conflict.~~ If there is agreement on a sanction before the findings are officially recorded, the formal proceedings shall be terminated and the situation, including imposition of the agreed sanction, monitored by the Human Resource Officer for one (1) year after the resolution.
7. If a formal complaint process is begun that results in a finding that the respondent has discriminated against the complainant and sanctions are recommended and the Human Resource Officer is unable to obtain an agreement among the parties and the respondents chair for the sanction to be imposed or if the decision was reached that there was no discrimination, the detailed findings of the Hearing Committee including evidence relied on and reasons for its decision shall be given to the complainant, respondent,

respondent's supervisor/chair, appropriate dean and vice chancellor and the chancellor. Either party may file a rebuttal statement for inclusion in that file.

8. Appeals shall follow normal University appeals procedures found in the appropriate sections of the *Faculty Handbook*.

Confidentiality

Informal Complaints

All persons involved in informal hearings are obliged to make every reasonable effort to preserve the confidentiality of the information presented. The names of the complainant and alleged offender will remain anonymous. The complainant's name will be disclosed to the alleged offender only if the complainant has given permission. If it is impossible to conduct an informal review without disclosure of names, the Human Resources Officer will discuss this with the complainant.

Preserving Confidentiality

Every effort must be made to restrict the information pertaining to an informal complaint to those immediately charged with conducting the informal investigation and appropriate administrative officials.

Formal Hearings and the Final Disposition

All facts in a case are confidential. The employee's supervisor together with the Human Resources Officer will inform both parties, in confidence, of the results of the investigation and sanctions or disciplinary actions recommended by the hearing panels. Students will be informed by the Dean of Students. A permanent record of the case and the findings will be maintained by the Human Resources Officer.

The Human Resources Officer will prepare an annual report for the Chancellor on the number of cases heard and types of cases presented in which discrimination or denial of equal opportunity were alleged. Further, the Human Resources Officer will assess the significance of the data and include recommendations for specific actions that can be taken to ameliorate further occurrences of a similar nature.

Appendix D – Conduct of Hearings Regarding Faculty Discrimination

The chairperson shall preside at the hearing; call the hearing to order; call the role of the hearing panel members in attendance; ascertain the presence or absence of the faculty member charged with the violation; ascertain the presence of the Human Resources Officer, the accuser, the non-participating representatives if any of the faculty member and the accuser; read the notice of hearing and charges; verify the receipt of notice of charges by the faculty member; report any continuance requested or granted and any special or extraordinary procedures to be employed during the hearing; and inform the hearing panel members and those involved in the hearing that the hearing is being recorded.

1. Opening statements:

- a) The Human Resources Officer shall make opening remarks outlining the general nature of the case and testifying to any facts the investigation has revealed;
- b) The faculty member may make a statement to the hearing panel about the charge at this time or at the conclusion of the University's or accuser's presentation. Witnesses shall be excluded from the hearing prior to the time their testimony is given. Persons who have been present during any part of the hearing may be allowed to testify only in those rare instances when the party can persuade the entire hearing panel that the need for such testimony could not reasonably have been anticipated.

2. University or accuser's evidence:

- a) Witnesses testifying against the faculty member are to be called and identified or their affidavit of written reports of evidence introduced as appropriate;
- b) The committee may question witnesses at any time;
- c) The faculty member may examine evidence presented to the committee against him or her;
- d) The faculty member may question witnesses testifying against him or her; and
- e) The faculty member may consult his or her non-participating representative during the hearing.

3. Faculty member evidence:

- a) Witnesses testifying on behalf of the accused are to be called and identified and written reports of evidence introduced as appropriate;
- b) The committee may question the witnesses testifying on behalf of the student(s) at any time;
- c) The faculty member may examine evidence presented to the hearing panel.

4. Rebuttal of evidence: The hearing panel may permit the University, accuser, or the faculty member to offer any matter in rebuttal of the other's presentation. Any party may refuse to answer questions and the hearing panel may draw any reasonable inferences from such refusal.

5. Rights of hearing panel: The hearing panel shall have the right:

- a) To permit the incorporation in the record by a reference of any document, affidavit, or other thing produced and desired in the record by the University, the accuser or the accused; To question witnesses or other evidence introduced by either the University, the accuser, or the accused at any time;
- b) To hear from the Human Resources Officer about dispositions made in similar cases and, when a violation is found, to request the Human Resources Officer to open the faculty member's records concerning his or her prior disciplinary record and any dispositions offered to the faculty member appearing before the hearing panel;
- c) To call additional witnesses or require additional investigation;
- d) To dismiss any action at any time or permit informal disposition as otherwise provided;

- e) To permit or require at any time amendment of the Notice of Hearing to include new or additional matters which may come to the attention of the hearing panel before final determination of the case, provided that the hearing panel shall grant to the accused, Human Resources Officer, or accuser, such time as the hearing panel may determine reasonable under the circumstances to answer or explain the additional matters;
- f) To dismiss any person from the hearing who interferes with or obstructs the hearing or fails to abide by the ruling of the chairperson or the hearing panel; and
- g) To hear or not to hear such witnesses or persons testifying and evidence as it may deem relevant and fair, including, but not limited to, any information made a part of the original report.

6. Determination by hearing panel: The hearing panel shall make its findings and determinations in executive sessions out of the presence of the Human Resources Officer, the accused, the accuser and all others. The hearing panel shall make its recommendation on the sanction, if any, to be imposed. No sanction shall be imposed on the faculty member unless a majority of the hearing panel present is reasonably convinced by the evidence that the faculty member has committed the violation and should be disciplined therefore. A hearing panel member shall not vote if he or she was not present throughout the full hearing.

7. Official report of findings and determinations: The hearing panel shall promptly transmit its findings and determinations in writing to the Human Resources Officer.

8. Other procedural questions: Procedural questions not covered by these general rules which arise during the hearing shall be determined by the chairperson, whose ruling shall be final unless the chairperson presents the question to the committee at the request of a member of the committee. A party may appeal any procedural matters to the Judicial Council.

9. General rules of decorum:

- a) All requests to address the committee shall be addressed to the chairperson, and the person shall identify himself or herself before speaking;
- b) the chairperson will rule on all requests and points of order, which ruling shall be final, and all participants shall abide thereby, unless the chairperson presents the question to the committee at the request of a member of the committee, in which event the ruling of the committee by majority vote shall be final;
- c) rules of common courtesy and decency shall be observed at all times; and
- d) the Human Resources Officer, the faculty member, or the accuser may request clarification of a procedural matter at any time by addressing the chairperson after recognition.