MEMORANDUM
December 1, 2011
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David Daniel
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FROM: Office of Academic Governance
Vicki Carlisle, Academic Governance Secretary

SUBJECT: Academic Council Meeting

The Academic Council will meet on Wednesday, December 7, 2011 at 2:00 p.m. in the Osborne Conference Room, ECSS 3.503. Please bring the agenda packet with you to the meeting. If you cannot attend, please notify me at vicki.carlisle@utdallas.edu or x6751.
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2011-2012 ACADEMIC COUNCIL

R. Chandrasekaran
David Cordell**
Murray Leaf*
Dennis Miller
Tim Redman
Richard Scotch
Tres Thompson
Sharkey Anderson, Student Government President

*Speaker
**Secretary
AGENDA

ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING
December 7, 2011
Osborne Conference Room, ECSS 3.503

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS & QUESTIONS    DR. DANIEL
2. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA                        DR. LEAF
3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   November 2, 2011 Meeting       DR. LEAF
4. SPEAKER’S REPORT                   DR. LEAF
5. FAC REPORT                        DR. LEAF
6. SCHEDULE FOR DECEMBER-JANUARY SENATE AND COUNCIL MEETINGS DR. LEAF
7. POSSIBLE CEP PROPOSAL – REVIEW OF FIRST 40 PAGES OF CATALOG DR. CANTRELL
8. POLICY ON ACADEMIC INTEGRITY IN THESIS AND DISSERTATIONS DR. LEAF
9. ADJOURNMENT                        DR. DANIEL
UNAPPROVED AND UNCORRECTED MINUTES

These minutes are disseminated to provide timely information to the Academic Council. They have not been approved by the body in question, and, therefore, they are not the official minutes.

ACADEMIC COUNCIL MEETING
NOVEMBER 2, 2011

PRESENT: Hobson Wildenthal, Murray Leaf, David Cordell, R. Chandrasekaran, Dennis Miller, Tim Redman, Richard Scotch, Tres Thompson

ABSENT:

VISITORS: Andrew Blanchard, Abby Kratz, Sharkey Andrews

1. CALL TO ORDER, ANNOUNCEMENTS & QUESTIONS:
Dr. Wildenthal called meeting to order. He reported that the main focus right now is working to get approval for a tuition increase for next year. Dr. Blanchard is holding meetings to work out the details. Our tuition plan is different from the other System campuses because we have a locked-in rate and any increases that are approved will only apply to new students.

The UT System is continuing to work on revisions to MyEdu, which is a software program designed to help with advising.

2. APPROVAL OF AGENDA
Tim Redman moved to approve the agenda as circulated. Richard Scotch seconded. The agenda was approved.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
Richard Scotch moved to approve the minutes as circulated. Tim Redman seconded. The minutes were approved.

4. SPEAKER’S REPORT (Murray Leaf)
Everyone selected to be a member of the Hearing Pool for academic dishonesty cases has been notified and Gene Fitch has scheduled the first training session.

Sumit Majumdar contacted Speaker Leaf about a concern raised by a recent article in The Mercury about Indian students splitting leases in the University apartments and violating the number of allowed tenants in the apartments. The article evidently has some truth behind it, although there is no evidence that the practice is more prevalent among Indian students than others. It appears that there may be a more serious issue with housing than current plans recognize. When confronted with the issue administrators are telling students that there is no waiting list and everyone who needs housing has it. However, it appears possible that one reason why there is no waiting list is because of the doubling up of tenants in the apartments. Off-campus housing may also be more problematic than we recognize because of lack of
transportation, safety issues and the quality of available housing. Speaker Leaf has suggested that members of the Indian Student Association and the Chinese Student Association could address the Senate to present their views on this issue. Richard Scotch questioned what role the Senate could take in solving student housing issues. It was suggested that instead of a presentation to the Senate perhaps the students should meet with the appropriate committee responsible for housing. Dr. Jamison is continuing to work on expanding shuttle service to have more routes available and running later. Richard Scotch mentioned that it is critical that our communication with all students at the time of acceptance is quite clear when it comes to housing. Some students, especially international students, may think that acceptance to the university automatically ensures a place in housing. The council agreed that if the students came forward with a presentation, Dr. Leaf would ask them to bring it to the Council to see what to do next.

Leadership Training: For at least the last six years, we have been talking about providing some guidance for people newly assigned to positions of leadership at about the level of a department chair. About four years ago, the FAC presented a plan to the UT System. The UT System took it up, and in 2008 announced the creation of the Leadership Institute, under the office of Geri Malandra. We reviewed the program here, in Council, and our conclusion was that it was too focused on compliance issues and not enough concerned with what we felt was most needed, which was the change in perspective that a person has to make when going from being an individual faculty member talking to a Chair or Dean to that of being a Chair or Dean talking to a body of faculty. The other problem with the program was that it was never big enough to reach down to the level we were most concerned with; it was forced by the demographics to focus on higher levels. So basically, the idea did not work as intended. Now, UTSA may be working out a successful alternative approach.

On October 14, I attended a session of a leadership training program that UTSA has developed for its staff and faculty. They call it Leadership UTSA. They take 20 people, about equally faculty and staff, and conduct a year-long series of one-day sessions. This is their third cohort. Each day they have substantial readings, then one or a few groups works up a presentation with their own analysis, and then they have some kind of exercise. In my case, the readings were Birnbaum, *How Colleges Work*, and Pawlak and Bergquist, *The Six Cultures of the Academy*. My job was to follow up with a one-hour presentation on organizing, organizational design, and how one writes good policy.

My conclusion was that it was a good class; the group was lively, the discussion on point, and practically everyone seemed to be getting something out of it and seemed to enjoy doing so. I think it would be a good model for us; certainly it is worth looking into. The individuals who are coordinating it for them are Mansour El Kkhiaa and Gage Paine. They would be happy to come here to talk about it. They have a website: [http://utsa.edu/today/2011/07/leadershiputsa.html](http://utsa.edu/today/2011/07/leadershiputsa.html)

5. FAC REPORT (Murray Leaf)
Activity has mainly focused on a continuing effort by some members to approve an alternative wording to the amendments to the Regents policy on post tenure review. The proponents circulated a version and voted with a mail ballot; the vote was 17 in favor and 2 opposed. Since the total vote added up to a quorum (which is half of the total membership), the Chair has said it is in order and will forward it to Pedro Reyes.
The second area of concern continues to be the resignation of David Prior and what to do about it. All but one of the Academic campuses were represented at the Texas Council of Faculty Senates meetings, so we talked about it briefly. We agreed that we will write a memorandum stating what we think the faculty requires, and also that we felt that David understood and was committed to this. We will also offer to help in going forward.

Everything else is on the agenda.

**TEXAS COUNCIL OF FACULTY SENATES REPORT (Murray Leaf)**

The Texas Council of Faculty Senates held its fall meeting in Austin on Friday, October 28. The meeting is normally a day and a half, but this was compressed into one day to allow Friday to be devoted to a series of workshops by the AAUP on advocacy. I attended the TCFS meeting with Richard Scotch. We did not attend the AAUP workshops. We do not oppose advocacy, but we think we are already doing it.

One of the highlights of the program was a panel on the legislature by the legislative liaisons for UT, TAMU, University of Houston, and the Texas State University System. It was very interesting but too complicated to try to repeat. Basic conclusions were two: there was a high level of agreement in what the different panelists saw, and the overall prospects were not likely to improve in the next legislative session. Most likely they would get worse, because much of the present budgetary “savings” were actually pushing the deficit ahead to the next biennium.

The second highlight was a presentation on the proposed new Coordinating Board core requirements by Lucy Hester, who is in charge of them. It stays at 42 hours and seems mostly the same, except "computer literacy" is gone. But they seem to have added the idea of six broad categories of "skills" that may allow us some flexibility in what we classify as providing them.

I was particularly worried by their math requirement, which seems to preclude starting with calculus. I didn't ask a question to see if that is what she meant. I will leave it for someone else who better knows what we need. If I remember right, it seemed that this was just 3 hours, but perhaps 6 (I was not sure what the columns were on the table she showed).

Another area of possible use (or possible trouble) was "communication." This was 6 hours, or perhaps 12 (same table).

My overall sense is that the increasing pressure for transferability of core courses between campuses amounts, for us, to increasing pressure for mediocrity, and we need to think of ways to work within them to be more imaginative.

My conclusion was that it will intensify the need to add senior, tenured, faculty to the committee who are more engaged in research and graduate education, in order to be sure we are making the best possible use of the latitude we have left.

The third highlight was the campus reports. I think we are one of only about three campuses that did not report that the Coordinating Board was requiring them to cut one or more low producing programs. Otherwise, it was as usually grimly encouraging to see how much better we seem to be doing than most of the other institutions. As I think you know, we are often cited as a model for good governance. This time, in one conversation, I heard a new twist: one of the members remarked that she cited us to show that the faculty senate could actually get along with the administration. The relationship did not have to be adversarial.
6. **PRESENTATION & DISCUSSION OF ONLINE COURSE EVALUATION SYSTEM**  
Speaker Leaf reported that Simon Kane has been meeting with committee. He has set up a website and has a draft of the online course evaluation. The online form is shorter and better organized than the paper form. Speaker Leaf would like to have Simon give a demonstration of the form to the Senate. Chandra suggested that the online form be used only for a small group of classes before going live with all classes. Dr. Wildenthal said that any evaluations that are done this semester will be done electronically because we no longer have the contract to use the paper form. EPPS has been using a form of the online evaluation and the response rate has been very similar to the response rates with the paper form. Tim Redman moved to place this item on the Senate agenda. Tres Thompson seconded. The motion carried.

7. **SHOULD WE REVISE POLICY ON UPWARD EVALUATION OF ADMINISTRATORS TO ALLOW PETITION BY FACULTY?**  
Speaker Leaf has discussed this issue with President Daniel. Dr. Daniel does not think that it is a good idea to have the option to trigger an evaluation off-cycle. The Council agreed that this item should not go to Senate.

8. **ADDITIONS/REVISIONS TO ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE**  
Charge calls for three faculty and three Deans. We currently have five faculty and three deans. The Council agreed that adding more Deans to the committee would not be a good idea. Dr. Wildenthal will work with Dr. Tobey to rewrite the charge for the Committee. Dr. Chandrasekaran moved to place this item on the agenda. Tim Redman seconded. The motion carried.

9. **CEP PROPOSALS**  
The Committee on Educational Policy has not met, but Dr. Cantrell asked that we reserve space on the Senate agenda in case the revisions to the first 40 pages of the catalog are approved. It was agreed to leave a place-holder for an agenda item provided there are no major substantive issues to consider without adequate time to review the material. The CEP meeting is tentatively scheduled for November 14 and the Senate meeting is November 16.

There being no further business, Dr. Wildenthal adjourned the meeting.
Policy to Assure Academic Integrity for Master’s Theses and Doctoral Dissertations

1. The University of Texas at Dallas is committed to assuring that theses and dissertations submitted to meet the requirements for degrees shall meet the highest standards for academic integrity.

In cases of possible falsification of data or other research source material, or plagiarism in master’s theses or doctoral dissertations, the powers of the Dean of Students described in Regents Rules 50101 as being exercised by the Dean will be exercised by the Dean of Graduate Studies.

A degree may be revoked if data or other research source material on which a thesis or dissertation is based is found to be falsified, or if the thesis or dissertation is found to contain plagiarism.

The standard of scholarly integrity expected on master’s theses and doctoral dissertations is the same as what would be expected in submissions to a publisher or an academic journal.

Decisions made under this policy are not subject to appeal under Title V, Chapter 51, Subchapter B. Appeals of Academic Decisions Section 51.06

2. Procedures prior to acceptance of the thesis or dissertation shall be as follows.

2.1 Duties of thesis or dissertation chair and committee.

The duties of the dissertation or thesis chair include exercising due professional diligence to assure that factual claims made in theses and dissertations are consistent with the standards for scholarly publications in their discipline, and that the thesis or dissertation he or she approves is free of plagiarism to the best of their knowledge and judgment. Dissertation and thesis chairs should utilize text-checking services such as Turnitin.com, provided by the University, to highlight material that might have been copied without attribution. They should personally check to assure that this all material is properly and accurately credited. If there is ambiguity, chairs should consult with the other faculty on the committee. No committee should accept a thesis or doctoral dissertation that they believe contains falsified data or plagiarized text.

In a specialized subject area where general services like Turnitin.com may not have access to all sources from which material might be plagiarized, chairs should not rely on these services alone.

2.2. Referral to Dean of Graduate Studies. If a committee concludes that there has been intentional falsification of data or plagiarism, the dissertation should not be accepted. Instead, the committee should refer its conclusions to the Dean of Graduate Studies for consideration of disciplinary action.

2.3 Investigation by Dean of Graduate Studies. The Dean of Graduate Studies will proceed with the investigatory process as described in Regents’ Rules 50101 Sec. 4 to confirm or disconfirm the opinion of the thesis or dissertation committee. The Dean of Graduate Studies
may review the documents, discuss the allegations with the committee members, and call the
student to discuss the allegations.

2.4. Administrative disposition. Upon reaching his or her conclusion, the Dean of Graduate
Studies will give the accused student the option of accepting or disputing the findings, in
accordance with Regents Rule 50101 section 4.4. If the student elects not to dispute the facts, the
Dean will assign the appropriate penalty depending on the evident extent and character of the
plagiarism or falsification. If the Dean agrees that the plagiarism or falsification was of such
extent and character that it could be reasonably regarded as deliberate, the thesis or
dissertation will not be accepted and the student may be expelled. If the Dean concludes that
the falsification or plagiarism was a matter of scholarly error but not intentional deception, the
thesis or dissertation may not be accepted but the student may be allowed to continue in the
university subject to appropriate requirements. However, there will be no obligation on the part
of the thesis or dissertation committee members to continue to work with the student if they do
not wish to do so.

2.5. Hearing panel. If the student disputes the findings of fact of the Dean of Graduate Studies,
the Dean of Graduate Studies will appoint a hearing panel of three faculty other than the faculty
who were on the student’s committee, and one graduate student. This panel will act as the
“hearing officer” within the meaning of Regents’ Rule 50101, section 5. The faculty will be from
areas of study within or sufficiently close to the discipline concerned to know its conventions for
what should be cited and what can be said without citation, and to identify spurious data.

If no graduate student is willing to serve on the panel, the investigation will proceed with faculty
only. Three faculty shall constitute a quorum for a meeting of the panel.

The University of Texas at Dallas University Attorney or the University of Texas System
Office of General Counsel will provide guidance regarding the requirements for due process to the members of the panel.

2.6. Hearing process. The panel will hold a hearing in accordance with Regents Rule 50101
section 5. The hearing panel will call the concerned faculty, the student, and any other relevant
faculty or witnesses they deem appropriate. The student may also present documentary evidence
and witnesses. If the student seeks to bring legal advice, the panel may also call legal advice. If
the student obtains legal counsel, the student shall immediately notify the Dean of Graduate
Studies.

Legal counsel shall only provide advice, and shall not act as advocate in the hearing. Counsel
will neither question witnesses nor argue.

2.7. Disposition. The hearing panel will decide by majority vote. If the hearing panel
agrees that the plagiarism or falsification was of such an extent and character that it could
reasonably be regarded as deliberate, the thesis or dissertation will be rejected
retroactively and the degree will be revoked. If the hearing panel concludes that the
falsification or plagiarism was a matter of scholarly error but not intentional deception, the
thesis or dissertation may not be accepted but the student may be allowed to continue in the
university subject to appropriate requirements. However, there will be no obligation on the part of the thesis or dissertation committee members to continue to work with the student if they do not wish to do so.

The panel will either uphold the decision of the Dean of Graduate Studies or recommend a modification of the decision, but no action of the Dean of Graduate Studies or the panel can obligate faculty to accept a thesis or dissertation that they do not believe reflects accurate description and honest scholarship.

3. Procedures after the thesis or dissertation has been accepted and the degree awarded shall be as follow.

After a thesis or dissertation is accepted and made available to the public, allegations that data have been falsified or that material in a thesis or dissertation is plagiarized may arise from many sources. However they arise, and however they come to the attention of the university, they should be promptly referred to the Dean of Graduate Studies.

3.1. Investigation by Dean of Graduate Studies. The Dean of Graduate Studies will determine whether there is a prima facie possibility that the allegations are true. If the members of the thesis or dissertation committee are available, the Dean may consult with them. If the student is available, the Dean may call the student as in 2.3 above.

3.2. Administrative Disposition. If the Dean of Graduate Studies determines that there is a prima facie possibility that the allegations are true, and if the former student is available on campus, he or she will be asked if they dispute the facts. If they do not dispute the facts, the Dean may order the dissertation to be rejected and the degree withdrawn.

3.3. Hearing panel. If the former student is not available on campus, or if the former student disputes the findings of fact, the Dean of Graduate Studies will appoint a hearing panel of three faculty members in the subject area of the thesis or dissertation, plus one graduate student. This panel will act as the “hearing officer” within the meaning of Regents’ Rule 50101, section 5. Three faculty members shall constitute a quorum of the panel.

The Office of University of Texas at Dallas University Attorney or the University of Texas System Office of General Council will provide guidance regarding the requirements for due process to the members of the panel.

If the person charged is still a student or employee of the university, the Dean of Graduate Studies may take “Interim Disciplinary Action” in accordance with Regents Rule 50101 Section 4.1.

3.4 Hearing Process. The hearing panel will consider the documentary evidence and may call members of the original committee, anyone who is making the charge, and the former student who is accused if they are available. If the former student will attend and seeks to bring legal advice, the panel may also call legal advice. If the student obtains legal counsel, the student shall immediately notify the Dean of Graduate Studies.
Legal counsel shall only provide advice, and shall not act as advocate in the hearing. Counsel will neither question witnesses nor argue.

3.45. Disposition. **The panel will reach its decision by majority vote.** The panel will report its findings to the Dean of Graduate Studies and will either recommend that the degree awarded shall stand, or may recommend that the thesis or dissertation be rejected and the degree **withdrawn** or **revoked**. If the panel recommends that the dissertation be rejected and the degree be revoked, the Dean of Graduate Studies will ask the Academic Senate formally to withdraw its original approval and notify the President of the University accordingly.

4. Appeal process is as follows.

The student concerned may appeal in accordance with Rule 50101 Sec. 7. In accordance with the Rule, the appeal shall be based on the hearing record only.

5. When a degree is revoked, a permanent notification will be placed in the student’s academic transcript, the thesis or dissertation will be removed from the University of Texas at Dallas Library, and if the dissertation has been placed in a public repository that repository shall be notified of the action of the University of Texas at Dallas.
Policy to Assure Academic Integrity for Master’s Theses and Doctoral Dissertations

1. The University of Texas at Dallas is committed to assuring that theses and dissertations submitted to meet the requirements for degrees meet the highest standards for academic integrity.

In cases of possible falsification of data or other research source material, or plagiarism in master’s theses or doctoral dissertations, the powers of the Dean of Students described in Regents Rules 50101 as being exercised by the Dean will be exercised by the Dean of Graduate Studies.

A degree may be revoked if data or other research source material on which a thesis or dissertation is based is found to be falsified, or if the thesis or dissertation is found to contain plagiarism.

The standard of scholarly integrity expected on master’s theses and doctoral dissertations is the same as what would be expected in submissions to a publisher or an academic journal.

Decisions made under this policy are not subject to appeal under UTDSP5005, Chapter 51, Subchapter B. Appeals of Academic Decisions Section 51.06

2. Procedures prior to acceptance of the thesis or dissertation shall be as follow.

2.1 Duties of thesis or dissertation chair and committee.

The duties of the dissertation or thesis chair include exercising due professional diligence to assure that factual claims made in theses and dissertations are consistent with the standards for scholarly publications in their discipline, and that the thesis or dissertation he or she approves is free of plagiarism to the best of their knowledge and judgment. Dissertation and thesis chairs should utilize text-checking services such as Turnitin.com, provided by the University, to highlight material that might have been copied without attribution. They should personally check to assure that this material is properly credited. If there is ambiguity, chairs should consult with the other faculty on the committee. No committee should accept a thesis or doctoral dissertation that they believe contains falsified data or plagiarized text.

In a specialized subject area where general services like Turnitin.com may not have access to all sources from which material might be plagiarized, chairs should not rely on these services alone.

2.2 Referral to Dean of Graduate Studies. If a committee concludes that there has been intentional falsification of data or plagiarism, the dissertation should not be accepted. Instead, the committee should refer its conclusions to the Dean of Graduate Studies for consideration of disciplinary action.

2.3 Investigation by Dean by Dean of Graduate Studies. The Dean of Graduate Studies will proceed with the investigatory process as described in Regents’ Rules 50101 Sec. 4 to confirm or disconfirm the opinion of the thesis or dissertation committee. The Dean of Graduate Studies may review the documents, discuss the allegations with the committee members, and call the student to discuss the allegations.

2.4 Administrative disposition. Upon reaching his or her conclusion, the Dean of Graduate Studies will give the accused student the option of accepting or disputing the findings, in accordance with Regents Rule 50101 section 4.4. If the student elects not to dispute the facts, the Dean will assign the appropriate penalty. If the Dean agrees that the plagiarism or falsification was deliberate, the thesis or dissertation will not be accepted and the student may be expelled. If the Dean concludes that the falsification or plagiarism was a matter of scholarly error but not intentional deception, the thesis or dissertation may not be accepted and the student may be allowed to continue in the university subject to appropriate
requirements. However, there will be no obligation on the part of the thesis or dissertation committee members to continue to work with the student if they do not wish to do so.

2.5. Hearing panel. If the student disputes the findings of fact of the Dean of Graduate Studies, the Dean of Graduate Studies will appoint a hearing panel of three faculty other than the faculty who were on the student’s committee, and one graduate student. This panel will act as the “hearing officer” within the meaning of Regents’ Rule 50101, section 5. The faculty will be from areas of study within or sufficiently close to the discipline concerned to know its conventions for what should be cited and what can be said without citation, and to identify spurious data.

If no graduate student is willing to serve on the panel, the investigation will proceed with faculty only.

The University Dean of Students will provide guidance regarding the requirements for due process to the members of the panel.

2.6. Hearing process. The panel will hold a hearing in accordance with Regents Rule 50101 section 5. The hearing panel will call the concerned faculty, the student, and any other relevant faculty or witnesses they deem appropriate. The student may also present documentary evidence and witnesses. If the student seeks to bring legal advice, the panel may also call legal advice. If the student obtains legal counsel, the student shall immediately notify the Dean of Graduate Studies.

Legal counsel shall only provide advice, and shall not act as advocate in the hearing. Counsel will neither question witnesses nor argue.

2.7. Disposition. The panel will either uphold the decision of the Dean of Graduate Studies or recommend a modification of the decision, but no action of the Dean of Graduate Studies or the panel can obligate faculty to accept a thesis or dissertation that they do not believe reflects accurate description and honest scholarship.

3. Procedures after the thesis or dissertation has been accepted and the degree awarded shall be as follow.

After a thesis or dissertation is accepted and made available to the public, allegations that data have been falsified or that material in a thesis or dissertation is plagiarized may arise from many sources. However they arise, and however they come to the attention of the university, they should be promptly referred to the Dean of Graduate Studies.

3.1. Investigation by Dean of Graduate Studies. The Dean of Graduate Studies will determine whether there is a prima facie possibility that the allegations are true. If the members of the thesis or dissertation committee are available, the Dean may consult with them. If the student is available, the Dean may call the student as in 2.3 above.

3.2. Administrative Disposition. If the Dean of Graduate Studies determines that there is a prima facie possibility that the allegations are true, and if the former student is available on campus, he or she will be asked if they dispute the facts. If they do not dispute the facts, the Dean may order the dissertation to be rejected and the degree withdrawn.

3.3 Hearing panel. If the former student is not available on campus, or if the former student disputes the findings of fact, the Dean of Graduate Studies will appoint a hearing panel of three faculty members in the subject area of the thesis or dissertation, plus one graduate student. This panel will act as the “hearing officer” within the meaning of Regents’ Rule 50101, section 5.
The Dean of Students will provide guidance regarding the requirements for due process to the members of the panel.

If the person charged is still a student or employee of the university, the Dean of Graduate Studies may take “Interim Disciplinary Action” in accordance with Regents Rule 50101 Section 4.1.

3.4 Hearing Process. The hearing panel will consider the documentary evidence and may call members of the original committee, anyone who is making the charge, and the former student who is accused if they are available. If the former student will attend and seeks to bring legal advice, the panel may also call legal advice. If the student obtains legal counsel, the student shall immediately notify the Dean of Graduate Studies.

Legal counsel shall only provide advice, and shall not act as advocate in the hearing. Counsel will neither question witnesses nor argue.

3.4. Disposition. The panel will report its findings to the Dean of Graduate Studies and will either recommend that the degree awarded shall stand, or may recommend that the thesis or dissertation be rejected and the degree withdrawn.

4. Appeal process is as follows.

The student concerned may appeal in accordance with Rule 50101Sec. 7. In accordance with the Rule, the appeal shall be based on the hearing record only.