

To: Andrea M. Kasko, Chair, Academic Senate  
From: Brett Trueman, Chair, Charges Committee  
cc: Kathleen Bawn, Vice Chair/Chair-Elect, Academic Senate  
Jessica Cattelino, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate  
April de Stefano, Executive Director, Academic Senate  
Marian M. Olivas, Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate  
Members of the Charges Committee  
Date: October 26, 2023  
Re: **Proposed Policy “Public and Discretionary Statements by Academic Units”**

---

At its meeting on October 26, 2023, the Committee on Charges had a brief opportunity to discuss the proposal to create a policy addressing “Public and Discretionary Statements by Academic Units.” The Committee had these concerns:

- Why is this even needed when individuals and groups of individuals may use private means to make statements? No rationale is offered for why there is need for a policy that allows units to use the UCLA name to make discretionary “comments on institutional, local, regional, global or national events, activities or issues” and, further, to use University resources to see that these are “distributed, disseminated, posted online or otherwise shared via mass distribution with University constituencies or the public.”
- Why are “campus leaders” (Deans, Chairs, and “other”) listed as being allowed to make their own statements (p. 6)? Is this a proper use of the leadership role (disclaimer or not)? Committee members expressed concerns that UCLA itself, as one of the divisions of the University of California, is an “Academic Campus Unit.” As such, should the Chancellor or Vice Chancellors be allowed to make statements on behalf of UCLA without meeting the standards and providing the disclaimers outlined in the proposed procedures?
- The lack of uniform procedures is concerning. Instead, the policy leaves it to individual Academic Campus Units (widely defined as departments or divisions (both academic and nonacademic) as well as other official UCLA entities, including schools, centers, laboratories, institutes, the UCLA Academic Senate, and UCLA Extension) to develop, publish, and implement procedures that are supposed to meet 13 requirements for public statements; 11 additional procedural requirements for creating discretionary statements and 5 requirements for posting these statements. Conforming with the “codes of conduct” is just one of these requirements. Yet, nothing in the policy provides for review of these procedures to ensure they comply with the requirements, let alone the proper mechanism for enforcing misuse of the process.
- There is a tension between the right of groups to express an opinion and, as noted on p. 3 A6, statements that may violate the Faculty Code of Conduct.