

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, ACADEMIC SENATE

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • MERCED • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

Daniel L. Simmons
Telephone: (510) 988-0711
Fax: (510) 763-0309
Email: daniel.simmmons@ucop.edu

Chair of the Assembly and the Academic Council
Faculty Representative to the Board of Regents
University of California
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, California 94607-5200

February 11, 2011

Mark Yudof
President
University of California

RE: Proposal to Revise APM 010 and 015

Dear Mark:

At its meeting on January 26, 2011, the Academic Council adopted a resolution proposed by the Committee on Academic Freedom and reviewed by the campuses and Senate committees, to recommend revising the language of sections 010 and 015 of the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) to include within the protections of academic freedom the freedom to speak out on matters of institutional policy. Specifically, the proposed language changes are as follows.

The third sentence of the first paragraph of APM 010, *Academic Freedom*, should be amended as follows (with new material indicated by underscore and deletions by ~~strikeout~~):

The University of California is committed to upholding and preserving principles of academic freedom. These principles reflect the University's fundamental mission, which is to discover knowledge and to disseminate it to its students and to society at large. The principles of academic freedom protect freedom of inquiry and research, freedom of teaching, ~~and~~ freedom of expression and publication, and freedom to address any matter of institutional policy or action whether or not as a member of an agency of institutional governance.

In APM 015, *The Faculty Code of Conduct*, Part I, *Professional Rights of Faculty*, the opening paragraph should be amended, and we recommend insertion of a new subpart 4 (renumbering existing subparts 4 and 5 to 5 and 6, respectively), as follows:

In support of the University's central functions as an institution of higher learning, a major responsibility of the administration is to protect and encourage the faculty in its teaching, learning, research, University service, and public service. The authority to discipline faculty members in appropriate cases derives from the shared recognition by the faculty and the administration that the purpose of discipline is to preserve conditions hospitable to these pursuits. Such conditions, as they relate to the faculty, include, for example:

...

4. freedom to address any matter of institutional policy or action, whether or not as a member of an agency of institutional governance:

...

A full copy of APM sections 010 and 015 showing the changes is attached.

The revisions proposed by the Senate are required to assure faculty rights to actively participate in the shared governance of the University by incorporating within academic freedom the right to freely express opinions regarding institutional policies. Insertion of this language into the APM definition of academic freedom, which also expressly provides for entitlement to the protections of the United States and California Constitutions, and into the Faculty Code of Conduct is necessary because of ambiguities in the United States Supreme Court holding in *Garcetti v. Ceballos*, 547 U.S. 410 (2006), and because of the University's advocacy in *Hong v. Grant et. al*, 2010 U.S. App. LEXIS 23504 (9th Cir. unpublished opinion, 2010). In *Garcetti* the Court stated that, "when public employees make statements pursuant to their official duties, the employees are not speaking as citizens for First Amendment purposes, and the Constitution does not insulate their communications from employer discipline." (547 U.S. at 421). The Majority opinion in *Garcetti* also states that "We need not, and for that reason do not, decide whether the analysis we conduct today would apply in the same manner to a case involving speech related to scholarship or teaching." (547 U.S. at 425.) In *Hong*, the University of California, citing *Garcetti*, asserted that administrators and faculty were entitled, without violating First Amendment rights of the faculty member, to deny a faculty member's merit increase because of the faculty member's criticism of institutional policies. The *Hong* court dismissed the faculty member's suit on Eleventh Amendment Immunity grounds without addressing the *Garcetti* issue. Nonetheless, the position of General Counsel in *Hong* raised substantial concern among faculty, as is reflected in the attached letter to Senate Chair Harry Powell from the Committee on Academic Freedom, dated April 20, 2010, recommending revisions to APM 010 and 015. In the absence of First Amendment protections for speech in the course of employment, Academic Council believes that the University's concept of academic freedom requires clarification to explicitly recognize that faculty have freedom within the institution to robustly debate institutional policies without fear of disciplinary action or retribution.

The Academic Personnel Manual is an administrative document that represents, in part, a contract between the administration and the faculty. Revisions to the APM require a formal review by both the administration and the Academic Senate. . Formal review of these recommendations has been completed by the Senate as part of its process for making the recommendation. I hope that a formal administrative review can be undertaken expeditiously. If the administration believes that revisions to the proposed language are required, I will re-circulate the proposal to Senate agencies.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Daniel L. Simmons".

Daniel L. Simmons

President Mark Yudof

February 8, 2011

Page 3

C: Provost Pitts

Vice Provost Carlson

Vice Chair Anderson

Academic Council

University Committee on Academic Freedom

Executive Director Winnacker



UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM (UCAF)
Raymond Russell, Chair
raymond.russell@ucr.edu]

Assembly of the Academic Senate
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607-520
Phone: (510) 987-9466
Fax: (510) 763-0309

April 20, 2010

**HARRY POWELL, CHAIR
ACADEMIC SENATE**

RE: Proposed Amendments to APM 010 and 015

Dear Harry,

I am attaching proposed amendments to APM 010 and 015 that the University Committee on Academic Freedom unanimously approved at its meeting on March 18, and that we now ask you to forward to the Academic Council for its consideration.

The need for these amendments has arisen in the wake of recent court decisions that have narrowed the scope of academic freedom to teaching and research, leaving faculty vulnerable to punishment for opinions they express at faculty meetings. The AAUP Report, "Protecting an Independent Faculty Voice: Academic Freedom After Garcetti v. Ceballos" summarizes the recent court cases that have made it necessary to provide explicit protection to the rights of faculty who participate in shared governance. Nationwide the most important case has been the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in Garcetti v. Ceballos. For UC the most relevant case has been Hong v. Regents. Hong is a UC Irvine Professor who argues that he was denied a merit increase in retaliation for views he expressed on matters of departmental governance. UC attorneys argue that in light of Garcetti v. Ceballos, even if UC had done what is alleged, it would not have been illegal to do so.

In May 2008, the UC Irvine Divisional Senate asked UC's Office of the General Counsel to stop citing Garcetti v. Ceballos in court, because the implications of that decision were so threatening to academic freedom. At its March 2009 meeting, UCAF asked UC General Counsels Christopher Patti and Charles Robinson if UC attorneys would be able to comply with this request. Their response was that attorneys are ethically barred from omitting matters of law that can help their clients in court. They recommended that in so far as the federal court system does not sufficiently protect the academic freedom of faculty, the best way to safeguard the rights of UC faculty when they participate in shared governance is by proposing amendments to the APM.

The wording of the proposed amendments to APM 010 and 015 that was submitted to UCAF by the Divisional Committee at UC Davis incorporates the recommendations contained in the AAUP report, and has been explicitly approved by the AAUP.

If any of you would like any additional information about any of these matters, please do not hesitate to contact me. Also, I would be happy to join the Council meeting via telephone when this item is discussed to explain the proposed revisions and answer any questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Raymond Russell". The ink is dark and the signature is fluid, with the first and last names clearly distinguishable.

Raymond Russell, Chair
UCAF

GENERAL UNIVERSITY POLICY REGARDING APM - 010 ACADEMIC APPOINTEES Academic Freedom

Academic Freedom

The University of California is committed to upholding and preserving principles of academic freedom. These principles reflect the University's fundamental mission, which is to discover knowledge and to disseminate it to its students and to society at large. The principles of academic freedom protect freedom of inquiry and research, freedom of teaching, and freedom of expression and publication, and freedom to address any matter of institutional policy or action whether or not as a member of an agency of institutional governance. These freedoms enable the University to advance knowledge and to transmit it effectively to its students and to the public. The University also seeks to foster in its students a mature independence of mind, and this purpose cannot be achieved unless students and faculty are free within the classroom to express the widest range of viewpoints in accord with the standards of scholarly inquiry and professional ethics. The exercise of academic freedom entails correlative duties of professional care when teaching, conducting research, or otherwise acting as a member of the faculty. These duties are set forth in the Faculty Code of Conduct (APM - 015).

Academic freedom requires that teaching and scholarship be assessed by reference to the professional standards that sustain the University's pursuit and achievement of knowledge. The substance and nature of these standards properly lie within the expertise and authority of the faculty as a body. The competence of the faculty to apply these standards of assessment is recognized in the Standing Orders of The Regents, which establish a system of shared governance between the Administration and the Academic Senate. Academic freedom requires that the Academic Senate be given primary responsibility for applying academic standards, subject to appropriate review by the Administration, and that the Academic Senate exercise its responsibility in full compliance with applicable standards of professional care.*

Members of the faculty are entitled as University employees to the full protections of the Constitution of the United States and of the Constitution of the State of California. These protections are in addition to whatever rights, privileges, and responsibilities attach to the academic freedom of university faculty.

* The original language of APM - 010, which was drafted in 1934, associated academic freedom with scholarship that gave "play to intellect rather than to passion." It conceived scholarship as "dispassionate" and as concerned only with "the logic of the facts." The revised version of APM - 010 holds that academic freedom depends upon the quality of scholarship, which is to be assessed by the content of scholarship, not by the motivations that led to its production. The revision of APM - 010 therefore does not distinguish between "interested" and "disinterested" scholarship; it differentiates instead between competent and incompetent scholarship. Although competent scholarship requires an open mind, this does not mean that faculty are unprofessional if they reach definite conclusions. It means rather that faculty must always stand ready to revise their conclusions in the light of new evidence or further discussion. Although competent scholarship requires the exercise of reason, this does not mean that faculty are unprofessional if they are committed to a definite point of view. It means rather that faculty must form their point of view by applying professional standards of inquiry rather than by succumbing to external and illegitimate incentives such as monetary gain or political coercion. Competent scholarship can and frequently does communicate salient viewpoints about important and controversial questions.

GENERAL UNIVERSITY POLICY
REGARDING ACADEMIC APPOINTEES
The Faculty Code of Conduct

APM-015

This policy is the Faculty Code of Conduct as approved by the Assembly of the Academic Senate on June 15, 1971, and amended by the Assembly on May 30, 1974, and with amendments approved by the Assembly on March 9, 1983, May 6, 1986, May 7, 1992, October 31, 2001, and May 28, 2003, and by The Regents on July 18, 1986, May 15, 1987, June 19, 1992, November 15, 2001, and July 17, 2003. In addition, technical changes were made September 1, 1988.

Additional policies regarding the scope and application of the Faculty Code of Conduct and the University's policies on faculty conduct and the administration of discipline are set forth in APM - 016, the University Policy on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline.

The Faculty Code of Conduct as Approved by the Assembly of the Academic Senate

(Code of Professional Rights, Responsibilities, and Conduct of University Faculty, and University Disciplinary Procedures)

Preamble

The University seeks to provide and sustain an environment conducive to sharing, extending, and critically examining knowledge and values, and to furthering the search for wisdom. Effective performance of these central functions requires that faculty members be free within their respective fields of competence to pursue and teach the truth in accord with appropriate standards of scholarly inquiry.

The faculty's privileges and protections, including that of tenure, rest on the mutually supportive relationships between the faculty's special professional competence, its academic freedom, and the central functions of the University. These relationships are also the source of the professional responsibilities of faculty members.

It is the intent of the Faculty Code of Conduct to protect academic freedom, to help preserve the highest standards of teaching and scholarship, and to advance the mission of the University as an institution of higher learning.

Part I of this Code sets forth the responsibility of the University to maintain conditions and rights supportive of the faculty's pursuit of the University's central functions.

Part II of this Code elaborates standards of professional conduct, derived from general professional consensus about the existence of certain precepts as basic to acceptable faculty behavior. Conduct which departs from these precepts is viewed by faculty as unacceptable because it is inconsistent with the mission of the University. The articulation of types of unacceptable faculty conduct is appropriate both to verify that a consensus about minimally acceptable standards in fact does exist and to give fair notice to all that departures from these minimal standards may give rise to disciplinary proceedings.

In Part II a clear distinction is made between statements of (1) ethical principles and (2) types of unacceptable behavior.

1. Ethical Principles

These are drawn primarily from the 1966 *Statement on Professional Ethics* and subsequent revisions of June, 1987, issued by the American Association of University Professors. They comprise ethical prescriptions affirming the highest professional ideals. They are aspirational in character, and represent objectives toward which faculty members should strive. Behavior in accordance with these principles clearly precludes the application of a disciplinary sanction. These Ethical Principles are to be distinguished from *Types of Unacceptable Faculty Conduct* referred to in the following paragraph. The *Types of Unacceptable Faculty Conduct*, unlike the Ethical Principles, are mandatory in character, and state minimum levels of conduct below which a faculty member cannot fall without being subject to University discipline.

2. Types of Unacceptable Faculty Conduct

Derived from the Ethical Principles, these statements specify examples of types of unacceptable faculty behavior which are subject to University discipline because, as stated in the introductory section to Part II, they are “not justified by the Ethical Principles” and they “significantly impair the University’s central functions as set forth in the Preamble.”

The Ethical Principles encompass major concerns traditionally and currently important to the profession. The examples of types of unacceptable faculty conduct set forth below are not exhaustive. It is expected that case adjudication, the lessons of experience and evolving standards of the profession will promote reasoned adaptation and change of this Code. Faculty may be subjected to disciplinary action under this Code for any type of conduct which, although not specifically enumerated herein, meets the standard for unacceptable faculty behavior set forth above. It should be noted, however, that no provision of the Code shall be construed as providing the basis for judging the propriety or impropriety of collective withholding of services by faculty. Rules and sanctions that presently exist to cover such actions derive from sources external to this Code.

Part III of this Code deals with the enforcement process applicable to unacceptable faculty behavior. That process must meet basic standards of fairness and must reflect significant faculty involvement. In order to guide each campus in the development of disciplinary procedures that comply with this policy and Senate Bylaws, Part III provides an outline of mandatory principles to which each Division must adhere and discretionary principles which are strongly recommended.

Part I – Professional Rights of Faculty

In support of the University's central functions as an institution of higher learning, a major responsibility of the administration is to protect and encourage the faculty in its teaching, learning, research, **University service**, and public service. The authority to discipline faculty members in appropriate cases derives from the shared recognition by the faculty and the administration that the purpose of discipline is to preserve conditions hospitable to these pursuits. Such conditions, as they relate to the faculty, include, for example:

1. free inquiry, and exchange of ideas;
2. the right to present controversial material relevant to a course of instruction;
3. enjoyment of constitutionally protected freedom of expression;
4. **freedom to address any matter of institutional policy or action whether or not as a member of an agency of institutional governance;**
5. participation in the governance of the University, as provided in the Bylaws and Standing Orders of The Regents and the regulations of the University, including
 - (a) approval of course content and manner of instruction,
 - (b) establishment of requirements for matriculation and for degrees,
 - (c) appointment and promotion of faculty,
 - (d) selection of chairs of departments and certain academic administrators,
 - (e) discipline of members of the faculty, and the formulation of rules and procedures for discipline of students,
 - (f) establishment of norms for teaching responsibilities and for evaluation of both faculty and student achievement, and
 - (g) determination of the forms of departmental governance;
6. the right to be judged by one's colleagues, in accordance with fair procedures and due process, in matters of promotion, tenure, and discipline, solely on the basis of the faculty members' professional qualifications and professional conduct.

Part II – Professional Responsibilities, Ethical Principles, and Unacceptable Faculty Conduct

This listing of faculty responsibilities, ethical principles, and types of unacceptable behavior is organized around the individual faculty member's relation to teaching and students, to scholarship, to the University, to colleagues, and to the community. Since University discipline, as distinguished from other forms of reproof or administrative actions, should be reserved for faculty misconduct that is either serious in itself or is made serious through its repetition, or its consequences, the following general principle is intended to govern all instances of its application:

University discipline under this Code may be imposed on a faculty member only for conduct which is not justified by the ethical principles and which significantly impairs the University's central functions as set forth in the Preamble. To the extent that violations of University policies mentioned in the examples below are not also inconsistent with the ethical principles, these policy violations may not be independent grounds for imposing discipline as defined herein. The *Types of Unacceptable Conduct* listed below in Sections A through E are examples of types of conduct which meet the preceding standards and hence are presumptively subject to University discipline. Other types of serious misconduct, not specifically enumerated herein, may nonetheless be the basis for disciplinary action if they also meet the preceding standards.

A. Teaching and Students

Ethical Principles. "As teachers, the professors encourage the free pursuit of learning of their students. They hold before them the best scholarly standards of their discipline. Professors demonstrate respect for students as individuals and adhere to their proper roles as intellectual guides and counselors. Professors make every reasonable effort to foster honest academic conduct and to assure that their evaluations of students reflect each student's true merit. They respect the confidential nature of the relationship between professor and student. They avoid any exploitation, harassment, or discriminatory treatment of students. They acknowledge significant academic or scholarly assistance from them. They protect their academic freedom." (AAUP Statement, 1966; Revised, 1987) The integrity of the faculty-student relationship is the foundation of the University's educational mission. This relationship vests considerable trust in the faculty member, who, in turn, bears authority and accountability as mentor, educator, and evaluator. The unequal institutional power inherent in this relationship heightens the vulnerability of the student and the potential for coercion. The pedagogical relationship between faculty member and student must be protected from influences or activities that can interfere with learning consistent with the goals and ideals of the University. Whenever a faculty member is responsible for academic supervision of a student, a personal relationship between them of a romantic or sexual nature, even if consensual, is inappropriate. Any such relationship jeopardizes the integrity of the educational process.

In this section, the term student refers to all individuals under the academic supervision of faculty.

Types of unacceptable conduct:

1. Failure to meet the responsibilities of instruction, including:
 - (a) arbitrary denial of access to instruction;
 - (b) significant intrusion of material unrelated to the course;
 - (c) significant failure to adhere, without legitimate reason, to the rules of the faculty in the conduct of courses, to meet class, to keep office hours, or to hold examinations as scheduled;
 - (d) evaluation of student work by criteria not directly reflective of course performance;
 - (e) undue and unexcused delay in evaluating student work.
- 2 Discrimination, including harassment, against a student on political grounds, or for reasons of race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, ethnic origin, national origin, ancestry, marital status, medical condition, status as a covered veteran, or, within the limits imposed by law or University regulations, because of age or citizenship or for other arbitrary or personal reasons.
- 3 Violation of the University policy, including the pertinent guidelines, applying to nondiscrimination against students on the basis of disability.
- 4 Use of the position or powers of a faculty member to coerce the judgment or conscience of a student or to cause harm to a student for arbitrary or personal reasons.
- 5 Participating in or deliberately abetting disruption, interference, or intimidation in the classroom.
- 6 Entering into a romantic or sexual relationship with any student for whom a faculty member has, or should reasonably expect to have in the future, academic responsibility (instructional, evaluative, or supervisory).
- 7 Exercising academic responsibility (instructional, evaluative, or supervisory) for any student with whom a faculty member has a romantic or sexual relationship.

¹ A faculty member should reasonably expect to have in the future academic responsibility (instructional, evaluative, or supervisory) for (1) students whose academic program will require them to enroll in a course taught by the faculty member, (2) students known to the faculty member to have an interest in an academic area within the faculty member's academic expertise, or (3) any student for whom a faculty member must have academic responsibility (instructional, evaluative, or supervisory) in the pursuit of a degree.

B. Scholarship

Ethical Principles. “Professors, guided by a deep conviction of the worth and dignity of the advancement of knowledge, recognize the special responsibilities placed upon them. Their primary responsibility to their subject is to seek and to state the truth as they see it. To this end professors devote their energies to developing and improving their scholarly competence. They accept the obligation to exercise critical self-discipline and judgment in using, extending, and transmitting knowledge. They practice intellectual honesty. Although professors may follow subsidiary interests, these interests must never seriously hamper or compromise their freedom of inquiry.” (AAUP Statement, 1966; Revised, 1987)

Types of unacceptable conduct:

Violation of canons of intellectual honesty, such as research misconduct and/or intentional misappropriation of the writings, research, and findings of others.

C. The University

Ethical Principles. “As a member of an academic institution, professors seek above all to be effective teachers and scholars. Although professors observe the stated regulations of the institution, provided the regulations do not contravene academic freedom, they maintain their right to criticize and seek revision. Professors give due regard to their paramount responsibilities within their institution in determining the amount and character of the work done outside it. When considering the interruption or termination of their service, professors recognize the effect of their decision upon the program of the institution and give due notice of their intentions.” (AAUP Statement, 1966; Revised, 1987)

Types of unacceptable conduct:

- 1 Intentional disruption of functions or activities sponsored or authorized by the University.
- 2 Incitement of others to disobey University rules when such incitement constitutes a clear and present danger that violence or abuse against persons or property will occur or that the University’s central functions will be significantly impaired.
- 3 Unauthorized use of University resources or facilities on a significant scale for personal, commercial, political, or religious purposes.
- 4 Forcible detention, threats of physical harm to, or harassment of another member of the University community, that interferes with that person’s performance of University activities.
- 5 Discrimination, including harassment, against University employees on political grounds, or for reasons of race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, ethnic origin, national origin, ancestry, marital status, medical condition, status as a covered veteran or, within the limits imposed by law or University regulations, because of age or citizenship, or for other arbitrary or personal reasons.
- 6 Violation of the University policy, including the pertinent guidelines, applying to nondiscrimination against employees on the basis of disability.
- 7 Serious violation of University policies governing the professional conduct of faculty, including but not limited to policies applying to research, outside professional activities, conflicts of commitment, clinical practices, violence in the workplace, and whistleblower protections.

D. Colleagues

Ethical Principles. “As colleagues, professors have obligations that derive from common membership in the community of scholars. Professors do not discriminate against or harass colleagues. They respect and defend the free inquiry of associates. In the exchange of criticism and ideas professors show due respect for the opinions of others. Professors acknowledge academic debts and strive to be objective in their professional judgment of colleagues. Professors accept their share of faculty responsibilities for the governance of their institution.” (AAUP Statement, 1966; Revised, 1987)

Types of unacceptable conduct:

- 1 Making evaluations of the professional competence of faculty members by criteria not directly reflective of professional performance.
- 2 Discrimination, including harassment, against faculty on political grounds, or for reasons of race, religion, sex, sexual orientation, ethnic origin, national origin, ancestry, marital status, medical condition, status as a covered veteran, or, within the limits imposed by law or University regulations, because of age or citizenship or for other arbitrary or personal reasons.
- 3 Violation of the University policy, including the pertinent guidelines, applying to nondiscrimination against faculty on the basis of disability.
- 4 Breach of established rules governing confidentiality in personnel procedures.

E. The Community

Ethical Principles. “Faculty members have the same rights and obligations as all citizens. They are as free as other citizens to express their views and to participate in the political processes of the community. When they act or speak in their personal and private capacities, they should avoid deliberately creating the impression that they represent the University.” (U.C. Academic Council Statement, 1971)

Types of unacceptable conduct:

- 1 Intentional misrepresentation of personal views as a statement of position of the University or any of its agencies. (An institutional affiliation appended to a faculty member’s name in a public statement or appearance is permissible, if used solely for purposes of identification.)
- 2 Commission of a criminal act which has led to conviction in a court of law and which clearly demonstrates unfitness to continue as a member of the faculty.

Part III – Enforcement and Sanctions

The Assembly of the Academic Senate recommends that each Division, in cooperation with the campus administration, develop and periodically re-examine procedures dealing with the investigation of allegations of faculty misconduct and the conduct of disciplinary proceedings.

Procedures shall be consistent with the Bylaws of the Academic Senate. Each Division should duly notify the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction and the University Committee on Privilege and Tenure of the procedures it has adopted and any subsequent changes therein. These Committees in turn are directed to report periodically to the Assembly of the Academic Senate on procedures adopted by the Divisions and to recommend to the Assembly such action as they deem appropriate for assuring compliance with the Bylaws of the Academic Senate or the promotion of uniformity among Divisions to the extent to which it appears necessary and desirable.

- A. In the development of disciplinary procedures, each Division must adhere to the following principles:
- 1 No disciplinary sanction for professional misconduct shall be imposed by the administration except in accordance with specified campus procedures adopted after appropriate consultation with agencies of the Academic Senate, as prescribed in the introduction to this part of the Code. Systemwide procedures for the conduct of disciplinary hearings are set forth in Academic Senate Bylaw 336.
 - 2 No disciplinary sanction shall be imposed until after the faculty member has had an opportunity for a hearing before the Divisional Committee on Privilege and Tenure, subsequent to a filing of a charge by the appropriate administrative officer, as described in Academic Senate Bylaw 336.
 - 3 No disciplinary action may commence if more than three years have passed between the time when the Chancellor knew or should have known about the alleged violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct and the delivery of the notice of proposed disciplinary action.
 - 4 The Chancellor may not initiate notice of proposed disciplinary action unless there has been a finding of *probable cause*. The *probable cause* standard means that the facts as alleged in the complaint, if true, justify the imposition of discipline for a violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct and that the Chancellor is satisfied that the University can produce credible evidence to support the claim. In cases where the Chancellor wants a disciplinary action to proceed, the Divisional hearing committee must hold a hearing and make findings on the evidence presented unless the accused faculty member settles the matter with the Chancellor prior to the hearing or explicitly waives his or her right to a hearing.
 - 5 The procedures adopted shall include designation of the following disciplinary sanctions authorized in the University Policy on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline, of which this Faculty Code of Conduct is an integral part: written censure, reduction in salary, demotion, suspension, denial or curtailment of emeritus status, and dismissal from the employ of the University. The Divisional Committee on Privilege and Tenure shall not recommend the imposition of a sanction more severe than that in the notice of proposed disciplinary action. More than one disciplinary sanction may be imposed for a single act of misconduct, e.g. a letter of censure and a suspension.

- B. In the development of disciplinary procedures, it is recommended that each Division adhere to the following principles:
- 1 In order to facilitate the efficient and timely handling of disciplinary matters, it is recommended that procedures be developed that allow each Divisional Committee on Privilege and Tenure to sit in hearing panels smaller than the full committee.
 - 2 There should be an appropriate mechanism for consideration and investigation of allegations of misconduct received from members of the faculty, staff, students, the administration, and other members of the University community. Procedures should be developed which encourage a single formal investigation of the allegations leading to the proposed disciplinary action.
 - 3 Because it is desirable that the faculty meaningfully participate in its own self-discipline, and in order to provide the administration with faculty advice in the beginning stages of what may become formal disciplinary proceedings, appropriate procedures should be developed to involve the faculty in participating in the investigation of allegations of misconduct and/or in making recommendations to appropriate administrative officers whether a disciplinary charge should be filed. Divisions are encouraged to develop procedures to provide faculty investigators with training, consultation, or legal counsel to assist with the investigation of faculty disciplinary cases.
 - 4 There should be provision for informal disposition of allegations of faculty misconduct before formal disciplinary proceedings are instituted. Procedures should be developed for mediation of cases where mediation is viewed as acceptable by the Chancellor and the faculty member accused of misconduct. Mediators should be trained in mediation, be regarded as neutral third parties and have experience in the University environment. In cases where a settlement resolving disciplinary charges is entered into after a matter has been referred to an Academic Senate committee, the Chancellor is encouraged to consult with the Chair of the Divisional Committee on Privilege and Tenure prior to finalizing the settlement.
 - 5 Appropriate precautions should be taken to safeguard the confidentiality of investigative and disciplinary proceedings. Procedures should be developed that allow information about an ongoing disciplinary proceeding, including information about the outcome, to be shared with complainant(s), to the extent allowable by State law and University policy.
 - 6 There should be provision, to the maximum feasible extent, for separating investigative and judicial functions. A faculty member who has participated in investigating an allegation of misconduct or in recommending that a charge should be filed should thereafter not participate, as a member of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure, in the hearing of that charge.
 - 7 In the implementation of all procedures, specific provisions should be made for the time span within which certain actions may or must be taken. Every effort should be made to conform to reasonable, specified time frames. Ideally, a hearing should commence within 90 days of the date on which the accused faculty member has been notified of the intention to initiate a disciplinary proceeding. A faculty member who is entitled to a hearing should not be permitted thereafter to delay imposition of discipline by refusing to cooperate or being unavailable for a scheduled hearing. A hearing shall not be postponed because the faculty member is on leave or fails to appear.

GENERAL UNIVERSITY POLICY
REGARDING ACADEMIC APPOINTEES
The Faculty Code of Conduct

APM-015

- 8 There should be consideration of provision for the availability of removal or termination of a sanction, either automatically or by administrative discretion, in individual cases. The nature and circumstances of the offense should determine the severity and type of discipline.
- 9 Procedures should be developed for keeping records of disciplinary matters in a confidential manner and sharing such records with Senate and administrative officers with a need to know in accordance with State law and University policy.