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March 13, 2019

Robert May
Chair, Academic Council

RE: Systemwide Senate Review: Proposed Revisions to Senate Bylaw 336 and Proposed Revisions to SVSH Academic Frameworks

Dear Chair May:

The Executive Board of the UCLA Academic Senate discussed the proposed revisions to Senate Bylaw 336 and the proposed revisions to SVSH Academic Frameworks at its meeting on March 7, 2019. The Executive Board solicited comments from standing committees of the Senate, as well as the Faculty Executive Committees, to maximize faculty feedback; the individual responses received are attached.

In this response, we offer our insights into both the proposed revisions to Bylaw 336 and to the proposed revisions to SVSH investigation and adjudication framework for Senate and non-Senate faculty.

Proposed Revisions to Senate Bylaw 336

The UCLA Division of the Academic Senate welcomes the opportunity to comment on the suggested revisions to Senate Bylaw 336. These revisions, as your office has pointed out, respond to the recommendations made in the July 2018 California State Audit report on the additional steps that UCOP must take to address longstanding issues with the university’s response to sexual harassment complaints. Before we go any further, we must say that we were surprised to learn that in your presentation to the UC Regents on September 26, 2018, you apparently confirmed that the Academic Senate accepted the CSA’s recommendation that that the timeframe for disciplinary hearings must begin within sixty calendar days once the Chancellor files a charge and that the hearing committee must issue its recommendation to the Chancellor within thirty calendar days once the hearing has been concluded. We assume that this is an error, since any Senate agreement to these recommendations would of course be taken to a discussion and vote through our systemwide Academic Assembly. We would very much appreciate some clarification on what you said on this matter at the September 26, 2018 UC Regents meetings.

We have identified some serious drawbacks to the revisions that appear in the final redlined document dated December 11, 2018.

In 336.C.2, we are told that “the accused shall 14 calendar days from the receipt of the disciplinary charges in which to file an answer in writing with the Committee on Privilege and Tenure.” We know from experience that this timeline is simply too short.

336.D.1 involves the deletion of the opportunity for disciplinary charges also to “be resolved through mediation in cases where mediation is acceptable to the administration and the accused.” The cover letter from December 11, 2018 indicates that this deletion has been made because “the deadlines
[i.e. the recommended deadlines] under which P&T will be required to operate” indicate that “it will no longer be possible for P&T to suggest that a case be referred to mediation after charges have been filed.” This suggested revision is regrettable because mediation is often the most productive path toward early resolution in many different disciplinary cases. Cf. APM-015 B.4: “There should be provision for early resolution 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.”

This latter point highlights the problems involved in revising Bylaw 336 solely with SVSH cases in mind. Disciplinary cases are of course not restricted to SVSH.

Further, we noted on the SVSH policy that the administration acknowledged the CSA recommendations as recommendations and not as commands in extending their own time limits. We believe the Senate should take the same approach, especially since the OCR’s agreement (which is binding) directs the University to create timelines that are not only prompt but also reasonable. For that reason, the references to “calendar days” in the proposed revisions to Bylaw 336 should be changed to “business days,” since it will be very difficult for P&T committees to conduct their business in such a short space of time.

**Proposed Revisions to SVSH Academic Frameworks**

Section IV.D needs attention. Several high-profile court cases have made it clear that it is not desirable for a Title IX officer who had conducted an investigation and made a finding should not be involved in consultations about the best methods for resolving the case, especially when resolution entails sanctions or discipline. There needs to be a separation of interests between the investigator’s role in the Title IX office and the body that that recommends corrective or disciplinary measures. The peer review committee should have the authority to make the recommendations in consultation with the Academic Personnel Office.

Sincerely,

Joseph Bristow  
Chair, UCLA Academic Senate, 2018-2019

cc:  Hilary Baxter, Executive Director, Systemwide Academic Senate  
Sandra Graham, Immediate Past Chair, UCLA Academic Senate  
Michael Meranze, Vice Chair/Chair-Elect, UCLA Academic Senate  
Michael LaBriola, Principal Policy Analyst, Systemwide Academic Senate  
Linda Mohr, Chief Administrative Officer, UCLA Academic Senate
January 22, 2019

EXECUTIVE VICE CHANCELLORS/PROVOSTS
ACADEMIC COUNCIL CHAIR ROBERT MAY
VICE PROVOSTS/VICE CHANCELLORS - ACADEMIC AFFAIRS/ ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

Re: Systemwide Consultation on Proposed Revisions to Investigation and Adjudication Frameworks for Senate and Non-Senate Faculty and for Staff and Non-Faculty Academic Personnel under the Presidential Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment (SVSH) Policy

Dear Colleagues:

Attached for Systemwide Consultation are draft revisions to the Investigation and Adjudication Framework for Senate and Non-Senate Faculty (Faculty Framework) and the Investigation and Adjudication Framework for Staff and Non-Faculty Academic Personnel (Staff and NFAP Framework).

As mandated by the California State Auditor (CSA), the Systemwide Title IX Office revised the frameworks to: 1) require the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee to consult with their campus Title IX Officer on discipline for faculty, staff, and non-faculty academic personnel found in violation of the SVSH Policy, and 2) require the Chancellor to issue a final decision about discipline for Senate faculty within 14 days of receiving a recommendation from the Privilege and Tenure Committee.

Please note that these changes are required by CSA, and the Systemwide Title IX Office is soliciting feedback only on the redlined changes (not the document as a whole).

We would appreciate receiving your comments by March 25, 2019. Please submit your comments to the Systemwide Title IX Office at evelyn.cheng@ucop.edu. If you have any questions, please contact Evelyn Cheng, evelyn.cheng@ucop.edu, 510.987.0918.

Sincerely,

Susan Carlson
Vice Provost
Academic Personnel and Programs
Attachments
1. Redline version of Investigation and Adjudication Framework for Senate and Non-Senate Faculty
2. Redline version of Investigation and Adjudication Framework for Staff and Non-Faculty Academic Personnel
3. Excerpts from June 2018 CSA Report

cc: President Napolitano
     Provost and Executive Vice President Brown
     Chief Operating Officer and Chief of Staff Nava
     Vice President Duckett
     Vice President Ellis
     Vice President Humiston
     Vice Provost and Chief Outreach Officer Gullatt
     Deputy General Counsel Woodall
     Academic Affairs/ Academic Personnel Directors
     Executive Director Baxter
     Executive Director Chester
     Executive Director Peterson
     Director Grant
     Director Lee
     Interim Systemwide Title IX Coordinator Taylor
     Coordinator Cheng
The University of California

It Must Take Additional Steps to Address Long-Standing Issues With Its Response to Sexual Harassment Complaints

Report 2017-125
sexual harassment policy, the role of the campus coordinators is to coordinate with decision makers to ensure that the university imposes appropriate discipline on all respondents found to have violated its policy, regardless of whether the respondents are faculty or staff members. Similarly, the university campus coordinators could act as a safeguard, ensuring that campuses have valid reasons for imposing discipline that deviates from the systemwide practice.

Recommendations

To achieve prompt resolution of sexual harassment complaints against faculty respondents, the Regents should ensure that the Academic Senate further defines its bylaws with written requirements for the tenure committee that specify exact time frames for completing the phases of the disciplinary process. The following changes should take effect by July 2019:

- Require that a hearing be scheduled to begin within 60 calendar days from the date the chancellor files charges with the tenure committee unless the committee chair extends this time frame for good cause, which the written requirements should define.

- Require that the tenure committee issue a recommendation within 30 calendar days of concluding the hearing. The written requirements should define when a hearing is considered concluded.

To ensure prompt resolution of sexual harassment complaints against faculty respondents, the Office of the President should do the following:

- Amend the appropriate policies to require that the chancellor or designee issue a final decision about discipline within 14 calendar days following receipt of the tenure committee’s recommendation. This change should take effect by July 2019.

- After the Academic Senate develops written requirements to specify exact time frames, complete an annual review of all cases involving Senate faculty to determine the length of time the adjudication process lasted. If an adjudication process takes longer than the time frames specified, the Office of the President should work with the Regents and the Academic Senate to develop further measures to enforce a more prompt adjudication process. The Office of the President should complete its first review by October 2020.
To ensure that the campuses impose appropriate disciplinary sanctions and to determine whether any additional remedies need to be provided, the Office of the President should modify university policy to ensure that campus coordinators consult on the appropriateness of the discipline for respondents found to have violated university policy. This policy change should take effect by July 2019.
Dear State Auditor Howle:

I write regarding your draft audit report on the University of California’s response to sexual harassment and sexual violence (SVSH) complaints. UC shares your commitment to combatting and preventing SVSH, as demonstrated by the many proactive changes and improvements we have made throughout our University system since I arrived in 2013.

UC accepts all of the recommendations made to the University of California Office of the President and is committed to implementing them, as they further reinforce and improve our Title IX policies and procedures. I am pleased that the audit found no instances of punitive settlement agreements, and that settlement agreements are reasonable and not intended to restrict the opportunities of students who bring legal challenges against the University. I understand it was these concerns that gave rise to the legislative request for the audit, and I am gratified CSA’s conclusions underscore our strong commitment to protecting our community from retaliation.

I would like to highlight some crucial context for the audit report:

- **UC has made recent, significant improvements not yet in place during the period of CSA’s review.** UC issued a robust systemwide SVSH policy in 2016 that defined prohibited behavior, set forth the University’s prevention and response obligations, and established the authority of the Title IX coordinators. As CSA recommends, we will soon revise this policy to ensure that it better reflects best practices. The University later adopted systemwide procedures for investigating and adjudicating SVSH reports for student respondents in 2016 and for faculty and staff respondents in 2017. The timeliness of investigations, transparency of outcomes and consistency of discipline are among the critical issues UC took the initiative to address. These major procedural changes were not yet in place during most of the timeframe that CSA analyzed. The improvements and progress in the 2017 procedures for faculty and staff respondents, in particular, are not reflected in the data reviewed during the audit.
• **In its efforts UC has been, and must continue to be, mindful of the University’s shared governance system.** We value our consultative relationship with the University’s Academic Senate, which has its own faculty code of conduct and bylaws. Although UC adopted a framework establishing timelines and procedures for some parts of the faculty disciplinary process, Privilege and Tenure proceedings – and any associated timeframes – are governed by the faculty bylaws and associated procedures, which can only be changed by the Academic Senate. We have sought to fully engage the Senate in our SVSH efforts, including through the Joint Committee of the Administration and Academic Senate in 2015. More recently, I asked the Senate to provide recommendations on how to define a reasonably prompt timeframe to complete the Privilege and Tenure process. Such a timeframe would address the concerns previously identified by my office, which are now echoed in CSA’s findings.

• **Better University procedures and more resources have led to an encouraging rise in the number of SVSH complaints.** I am pleased your audit recognized that UC’s improvements have resulted in increased reporting. Campuses have significantly improved their ability to track the complaints they receive. We believe more people have come forward with concerns because of our systemwide improvements: mandatory education and training for employees and students, additional Title IX staff on each campus, and a more robust SVSH policy that requires “responsible employees” to notify their Title IX offices of any complaints. The increased number of reports also reflects the campus communities’ greater trust in the Title IX offices, trust essential for their continued successful operations and earned through their significant work.

• **The creation of a systemwide Title IX office marks an important step toward further strength and consistency.** My office established the first systemwide Title IX coordinator position in February 2017 and directed that campus Title IX officers report to this office, as well as to their campus leadership. The office is in charge of implementing the SVSH policy and related procedures and best practices across UC campuses. In a very short time, this office has provided strong guidance enabling UC to develop fundamental systemwide procedures, streamline processes, clarify policy and improve consistency. We intend to continue that progress through this critical component of UC’s response to SVSH, and CSA’s recommendation for a strategic plan will help provide this office a clear direction for its future efforts.
• **UC has taken many other measures to strengthen its efforts to combat SVSH in our community.** In addition to the improvements described above, UC has taken many additional proactive steps since 2014, including requiring each campus to have both a confidential advocacy office to support individuals who have experienced SVSH, and a respondent services coordinator to assist students alleged to have engaged in SVSH. We have implemented mandatory systemwide SVSH education for students, faculty, and staff, and have established a response team on each campus to ensure responses to all reports are prompt, equitable, and trauma-informed. We have formed a systemwide peer review committee to assess and approve all sanctions that involve a senior University leader, appointed a committee to recommend improvements in responding to SVSH complaints against staff, and established a student advisory board to advise the systemwide Title IX office on prevention and response.

UC understands the need for a strong stance against sexual violence and sexual harassment, meaningful efforts at prevention, and fair and timely processes for addressing complaints. To that end, the University has made great, proactive strides in improving its response to SVSH issues. We appreciate the time CSA has taken to identify ways for us to build upon our momentum and progress. We will continue to uphold our commitment to ensure a safe and secure environment for all members of the UC community.

Yours very truly,

Janet Napolitano
President
INTRODUCTION

Consistent with the UC Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment (“SVSH Policy”), the following describes the University’s process for investigating and adjudicating alleged violations of the SVSH Policy in instances where the respondent is a University faculty member whose conduct is governed by Section 015 of the Academic Personnel Manual (APM-015), The Faculty Code of Conduct (“Code of Conduct”). A flow chart illustrating the process for complaints against Academic Senate faculty can be found in Attachment 1. A flow chart illustrating the process for complaints against non-Senate faculty can be found in Attachment 2.

These documents should be read in conjunction with the SVSH Policy, as well as applicable APM provisions, including APM-015, APM-016 (University Policy on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline), and APM-150 (Non-Senate Appointees/Corrective Action and Dismissal), and applicable Senate Bylaws, including Senate Bylaw 336 (procedures for disciplinary hearings) and Senate Bylaw 335 (procedures for considering grievances). The documents also incorporate recommendations issued by the Joint Committee of the Administration and the Senate, as accepted by President Napolitano.

Applicable definitions can be found in the SVSH Policy and are incorporated herein. Other definitions can be found in applicable APMs and Senate Bylaws and are incorporated herein.


I. REPORTING OPTIONS AND RESOURCES (Stage 0)

A. Reporting Options

Any person may make a report, including anonymously, of conduct prohibited under the SVSH Policy (“Prohibited Conduct”) to the Title IX Office. The Title IX Office is responsible for receiving and responding to reports of Prohibited Conduct.

A person may also make a report to a Responsible Employee as defined by the SVSH Policy. The SVSH Policy requires a Responsible Employee who becomes aware of an incident of Prohibited Conduct to report it to the University by contacting their location’s Title IX Officer or designee.

While there is no time limit for reporting, reports of Prohibited Conduct should be brought forward as soon as possible.
A complainant may choose to make a report to the University and may also choose to make a report to law enforcement. A complainant may pursue either or both of these options at the same time. Anyone who wishes to report to law enforcement can contact the UC Police Department.

B. Confidential Resources
The University offers access to confidential resources for individuals who have experienced Prohibited Conduct and are seeking counseling, emotional support or confidential information about how to make a report to the University. Confidential Resources are defined pursuant to the SVSH Policy and include individuals who receive reports in their confidential capacity such as advocates in the CARE Office for Sexual and Gender-Based Violence and Sexual Misconduct, as well as licensed counselors (e.g., Employee Assistance Program (EAP) and Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS)), and Ombuds.

These employees can provide confidential advice and counseling without that information being disclosed to the Title IX Office or law enforcement, unless there is a threat of serious harm to the individual or others or a legal obligation that requires disclosure (such as suspected abuse of a minor).

II. INITIAL ASSESSMENT (Stage 1)

Upon receipt of a report of or information about alleged Prohibited Conduct, the Title IX Officer will make an initial assessment in accordance with the SVSH Policy, which shall include making an immediate assessment concerning the health and safety of the complainant and the campus community.

A. Interim Measures
The University will also consider and take interim measures as appropriate to ensure the safety, well-being and equal access to University programs and activities of its students and employees. Interim measures include, but are not limited to, the following: no contact orders; housing assistance; academic support; and counseling.

Involuntary leave of a Senate faculty respondent may be imposed in accordance with APM-016. Investigatory leave of a non-Senate faculty respondent may be imposed in accordance with APM-150.

B. Written Rights & Options
The Title IX Officer will ensure that the complainant, if his or her identity is known, is provided a written explanation of rights and available options as outlined in the SVSH Policy, including:

1. How and to whom to report alleged violations;
2. Options for reporting to and/or notifying law enforcement and campus authorities;
3. Information regarding confidential resources;
4. The rights of complainants regarding orders of protection, no contact orders, restraining orders, or similar lawful orders issued by criminal or civil courts;
5. The importance of preserving evidence that may assist in proving that a criminal offense occurred or in obtaining a protection order;
6. Counseling, health, mental health, victim advocacy, legal assistance, visa and immigration assistance, and other services available both within the institution and the community; and
7. Options for, and available assistance to, a change to academic living, transportation, and working situations, if the complainant requests and if such options are reasonably available—regardless of whether the complainant chooses to report the crime to law enforcement.

III. INVESTIGATING AND RESOLVING REPORTS OF PROHIBITED CONDUCT (Stage 1)

Provided the University has sufficient information to respond, and in accordance with the SVSH Policy, the University may resolve reports of Prohibited Conduct by Alternative Resolution or Formal Investigation. Throughout the resolution process, the complainant and the respondent may be accompanied by an advisor. In addition, the University will offer to provide support services for the complainants and for the respondents.

A. Alternative Resolution
After a preliminary inquiry into the facts, the Title IX Officer may initiate an Alternative Resolution in accordance with the SVSH Policy.

B. Formal Investigation
In cases where Alternative Resolution is inappropriate or unsuccessful, the Title IX Officer may conduct a Formal Investigation, as contemplated in the SVSH Policy.

1. Notification to Chancellor
   The Title IX Officer will notify the Chancellor and the Chancellor’s designee when a Formal Investigation is commenced against a faculty respondent. The Title IX Officer will be sensitive in their communication to protect the neutrality of the Chancellor and the Chancellor’s designee, as well as the privacy of the complainant and the respondent.

   Thereafter, the Title IX Officer will regularly communicate with the Chancellor and the Chancellor’s designee regarding the status of the Formal Investigation.

2. Notice of Charges
   When a Formal Investigation will be conducted, the Title IX Office will send written notice of the charges to the complainant and respondent.

   The written notice will include:
a. A summary of the allegations and potential violations of the SVSH Policy;
b. The purpose of the investigation;
c. A statement that the investigative report, when issued, will make factual findings and a determination whether there has been a violation of the SVSH Policy;
d. A statement that the findings under the SVSH Policy will be based on the preponderance of the evidence standard and that a finding of a violation of the SVSH Policy will establish probable cause under APM-015;
e. A summary of the Title IX and faculty discipline process, including the expected timeline;
f. A summary of the rights of the complainant and respondent, including the right to an advisor;
g. A description of the resources available to complainant and respondent; and
h. An admonition against intimidation or retaliation.

3. Investigative Process
   The Title IX Officer will designate an investigator to conduct a fair, thorough, and impartial investigation.
   
a. Overview:
   During the investigation, the complainant and the respondent will be provided an equal opportunity to meet with the investigator, submit information, and identify witnesses who may have relevant information.

   The investigator will meet separately with the complainant, the respondent, and the third party witnesses who may have relevant information, and will gather other available and relevant information. The investigator may follow up with the complainant or the respondent as needed to clarify any inconsistencies or new information gathered during the course of the investigation.

   Disclosure of facts to persons interviewed will be limited to what is reasonably necessary to conduct a fair and thorough investigation. Participants in an investigation may be asked to maintain confidentiality when essential to protect the integrity of the investigation.

   The complainant or the respondent may have an advisor present when personally interviewed and at any related meeting. Other witnesses may have a representative present at the discretion of the investigator or as required by University policy or collective bargaining agreement.

b. Coordination with Law Enforcement:
   When a law enforcement agency is conducting its own investigation into the alleged conduct, the Title IX investigator will make every effort to coordinate
his or her fact-finding efforts with the law enforcement investigation. At the request of law enforcement, the investigation may be delayed temporarily to meet specific needs of the criminal investigation.

4. **Investigation Report and Finding**
   Following conclusion of the investigation, the Title IX investigator will prepare a written report. The written investigation report will include a statement of the allegations and issues, the positions of the parties, and a summary of the evidence.

   If the complainant or the respondent offered witnesses or other evidence that was not relied upon by the investor, the investigation report will explain why it was not relied upon.

   The investigation report will include findings of fact and a determination regarding whether, applying the preponderance of the evidence standard, there is sufficient evidence to conclude that respondent violated the SVSH Policy.

   A finding that the respondent violated the SVSH Policy will establish probable cause as defined in the Code of Conduct. ([APM-015](#) at III.A.4.)

5. **Notice of Investigation Outcome**
   Upon completion of the Title IX investigation report, the Title IX Officer or designee will send to the complainant and the respondent a written notice of investigation outcome regarding whether a violation of the SVSH Policy was found. The notice of investigation outcome will generally be accompanied by a copy of the investigation report, which may be redacted as necessary to protect privacy rights.

   The Title IX Officer or designee will also send the notice of investigation outcome and accompanying investigation report to the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee.

   The notice of investigation outcome will include:
   a. A statement of whether a preponderance of the evidence demonstrated that respondent violated the SVSH Policy;
   b. An admonition against intimidation or retaliation;
   c. An explanation of any interim measures that will remain in place;
   d. A statement that the complainant and respondent have an opportunity to respond in writing and/or in person to the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee; and
   e. A statement indicating whether it appears that further investigation by the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee or other appropriate body may be necessary to determine whether other violations of the Code of Conduct occurred, separate from any allegations of Prohibited Conduct that were investigated under the SVSH Policy.
In addition, if the investigation determined that the faculty respondent violated the SVSH Policy, the notice of investigation outcome will also include:

a. A statement that the finding that respondent violated the SVSH Policy constitutes a finding of probable cause as defined in APM-015;

b. For matters involving Senate faculty respondents, a description of the process for deciding whether and what discipline to impose, including a statement that the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee will engage the Peer Review Committee to advise on appropriate resolution, which may include pursuing discipline in accordance with APM-016;

c. For matters involving non-Senate faculty respondents, a description of the process for deciding whether and what discipline to impose, including a statement that the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee will engage the Peer Review Committee or consult with the Academic Personnel Office to advise on appropriate resolution, which may include corrective action or termination in accordance APM-150;

d. A statement of the anticipated timeline and a statement that both complainant and respondent will be informed of the final resolution of the matter.

6. Timeframe for Completion of Investigation; Extension for Good Cause

The notice of investigation outcome and accompanying investigation report will be issued promptly, typically within sixty (60) business days of initiation of the Formal Investigation, unless extended by the Title IX Officer for good cause, with written notice to the complainant and the respondent of the reason for the extension and the projected new timeline.

The Title IX Officer or designee will keep the complainant and the respondent regularly informed concerning the status of the investigation.

IV. ASSESSMENT AND CONSULTATION (Stage 2)

The Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee has the authority and responsibility to decide what action to take in response to the findings of the Title IX investigation report. The Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee may determine that additional investigation is required to determine whether other Code of Conduct violations occurred, but will not reinvestigate the allegations of Prohibited Conduct investigated by the Title IX Office. The Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee may consult with the Title IX Office, the Academic Personnel Office, or other appropriate entities at any time during the decision-making process.

A. Opportunity to Respond

The Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee will offer the complainant and the respondent an opportunity to respond to the notice of investigation outcome and accompanying investigation report, either through an in-person meeting with the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee, a written statement to the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee, or both.
The purpose of this response is not to challenge the factual findings in the Title IX investigation report or present new evidence, but to provide the complainant and the respondent with an opportunity to express their perspectives and address what outcome they wish to see.

B. Peer Review Committee for Senate Faculty
In the event that the Title IX investigation finds a Senate faculty respondent responsible for violating the SVSH Policy, the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee will engage the campus Peer Review Committee to advise on appropriate resolution.

The Peer Review Committee, composed on each campus at the direction of the President, will advise the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee regarding how to resolve the matter, including whether the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee should pursue a formal charge for violation of the Code of Conduct or pursue an early resolution. The Peer Review Committee should also provide advice on the appropriate discipline or other corrective or remedial measures.

The Peer Review Committee will be engaged in all cases where the Title IX investigation has found a Senate faculty respondent has violated the SVSH Policy.

C. Peer Review Committee or Consultation with Academic Personnel for Non-Senate Faculty
In the event that the Title IX investigation finds a non-Senate faculty respondent responsible for violating the SVSH Policy, the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee will engage the Peer Review Committee or consult with the Academic Personnel Office, depending on what form of consultation the campus decided to employ. Such consultation, as decided by the campus, will occur in all cases where the Title IX investigation has found that the non-Senate faculty respondent has violated the SVSH Policy. The advisory role of the Peer Review Committee is described in Section IV.B above.

D. Title IX Officer Consultation for Senate and Non-Senate Faculty
In all cases where the Title IX investigation has found a Senate or non-Senate faculty respondent responsible for violating the SVSH Policy, the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee will consult with the campus Title IX Officer on how to resolve the matter, including the appropriate discipline or other corrective measures.

V. DECISION ON SANCTIONS FOR SENATE FACULTY (Stage 3)

A. Decision by Chancellor or Chancellor’s Designee
Following consultation with the Peer Review Committee and Title IX Officer, in accordance with APM-016, the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee will decide what action to take to resolve the matter.
As stated in APM-015, “The Chancellor must initiate related disciplinary action by delivering notice of proposed action to the respondent no later than three years after the Chancellor is deemed to have known about the alleged violation.” As further stated in APM-015, “[f]or an allegation of sexual violence or sexual harassment, the Chancellor is deemed to know about an alleged violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct when the allegation is first reported to any academic administrator at the level of department chair or above or the campus Title IX Officer.” (APM-015, Part III, A.3.)

1. **No Formal Discipline**
   In the event the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee determines to resolve the matter without taking any formal disciplinary action, the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee will promptly communicate this decision and its rationale to both the complainant and the respondent.

2. **Early Resolution**
   The Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee can enter into an early resolution with the respondent in accordance with APM 016. An early resolution can be achieved at any time prior to the final imposition of discipline.

   Subsequent to the respondent agreeing to the terms of the early resolution, the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee will promptly inform complainant of those terms, including any discipline or other corrective or remedial measures, and the rationale for these terms.

3. **Charge Filed with Academic Senate Privilege & Tenure Committee**
   The Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee can take steps to propose discipline and file a charge with the Academic Senate’s Privilege & Tenure Committee without first pursuing early resolution, or if respondent does not agree to early resolution.

   The Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee will promptly inform complainant that the charge has been filed.

**B. Timeframe for Decision: Extension for Good Cause**

The Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee should implement his or her decision promptly, typically within 40 business days of receipt of the notice of investigation outcome and accompanying investigation report. If the matter has not been otherwise resolved within forty (40) business days, a charge will be filed with the Academic Senate’s Privilege & Tenure Committee. A charge will not be held in abeyance or suspended while an early resolution is being pursued or finalized.

Extensions to this timeline may be granted by the Chancellor for good cause with written notice to the complainant and respondent stating the reason for the extension and the projected new timeline.
C. Process Following the Filing of a Senate Charge
The procedures following the filing of a charge with the Academic Senate’s Privilege & Tenure Committee are set forth in the APM-015 and APM-016, Senate Bylaw 336 and other applicable Senate bylaws, as well as divisional bylaws on each campus.

The Title IX investigation report will be accepted as evidence in the Privilege & Tenure hearing. The Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee will ensure that complainant and respondent receive regular updates regarding the status of the proceedings.

Within 14 calendar days of receiving the recommendation from the Academic Senate’s Privilege & Tenure Committee, in accordance with APM-016 and other applicable procedures, the Chancellor will make a final decision regarding discipline, unless the decision involves dismissal for a faculty who has tenure or security of employment. As stated in APM-016, “Authority for dismissal of a faculty member who has tenure or security of employment rests with The Regents, on recommendation of the President, following consultation with the Chancellor.” (APM-016, Section II.6.) Extensions to this timeline may be granted by the Chancellor for good cause with written notice to the complainant and respondent stating the reason for the extension and the projected new timeline.

The complainant and the respondent will be promptly informed of the decision regarding discipline and its rationale.

VI. DECISION ON SANCTIONS FOR NON-SENATE FACULTY (Stage 3)

A. Decision by Chancellor or Chancellor’s Designee
Following consultation with the Title IX Officer and Peer Review Committee or Academic Personnel Office, and in accordance with APM-150, the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee shall decide what action to take to resolve the matter.

As stated in APM-015, “The Chancellor must initiate related disciplinary action by delivering notice of proposed action to the respondent no later than three years after the Chancellor is deemed to have known about the alleged violation.” As further stated in APM-015, “[f]or an allegation of sexual violence or sexual harassment, the Chancellor is deemed to know about an alleged violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct when the allegation is first reported to any academic administrator at the level of department chair or above or the campus Title IX Officer.” (APM-015, Part III, A.3.)

1. No Disciplinary Action
In the event the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee determines to resolve the matter without taking any disciplinary or corrective action, the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee will promptly communicate this decision and its rationale to both the complainant and respondent.
2. Informal Resolution
The Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee can pursue an informal resolution in accordance with APM-150, which may include discipline and/or other corrective or remedial measures. Informal resolution can be achieved at any time prior to the final imposition of dismissal or corrective action.

Subsequent to respondent agreeing to the terms of an informal resolution, the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee will promptly inform complainant of those terms, including any discipline or other corrective or remedial measures, and the rationale for these terms.

3. Notice of Intent
The Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee can issue a notice of intent instituting dismissal or other corrective action in accordance with APM-150.

B. Timeframe for Decision; Extension for Good Cause
The Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee should implement his or her decision promptly, typically within forty (40) business days of receipt of the notice of investigation outcome and accompanying investigation report. If the matter has not been otherwise resolved within forty (40) business days, a notice of intent shall be issued.

Extensions to this timeline may be granted by the Chancellor for good cause with written notice to the complainant and respondent stating the reason for the extension and the projected new timeline.

C. Process Following the Provision of a Written Notice of Intent.
The procedures following the provision of a notice of intent are set forth in APM-150.

Should the respondent submit a grievance under APM-140 alleging a violation of APM-150 or otherwise challenging an administrative decision described in this process, the Chancellor’s designee will ensure that both the complainant and respondent receive regular updates regarding the status of the grievance.

As stated in APM-140, “When a non-Senate faculty member receives notice of termination before the expiration of his or her appointment, he or she may select as a grievance mechanism either APM-140, as described in this policy, or Section 103.9 of the Standing Orders of The Regents (S.O. 103.9), the procedures of which are described in Academic Senate Bylaw 337. In selecting either APM-140 or S.O. 103.9, the non-Senate faculty member waives the right to invoke the other mechanism to review the same grievance.” (APM-140-14e.)

Subsequent to any final decision, the Chancellor or Chancellor’s designee will promptly inform the complainant and the respondent of the decision, including any final decision on discipline and its rationale.
INTRODUCTION

Consistent with the UC Policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment (“SVSH Policy”), the following describes the University’s process for investigating and adjudicating alleged violations of the SVSH Policy in instances where the respondent is either a University employee whose conduct is governed by Personnel Policies for Staff Members (“PPSMs”), and who is subject to disciplinary and termination procedures set forth in PPSM 62 (Corrective Action – Professional and Support Staff) and PPSM 64 (Termination and Job Abandonment) or a non-faculty academic appointee who is subject to disciplinary procedures under the Academic Personnel Manual ("APM"), APM-150 (Non-Senate Academic Appointees/Corrective Action and Dismissal). A flow chart illustrating the process for complaints against PPSM covered employees can be found in Attachment 1. A flow chart illustrating the process for complaints against non-faculty academic appointees can be found in Attachment 2.

This document should be read in conjunction with the SVSH Policy, as well as applicable PPSMs, including PPSM 62, PPSM 63 (Investigatory Leave) and PPSM 64, and applicable provisions of the APM, including APM-150. The documents also incorporate recommendations issued by the President’s Committee on Sexual Violence Sexual Harassment Disciplinary Process for UC Personnel other than Faculty, as accepted by President Napolitano.

Applicable definitions from the SVSH Policy are incorporated herein. Other definitions are found in the applicable PPSMs and applicable APMs and are incorporated herein.


I. REPORTING OPTIONS AND RESOURCES (Stage 0)

A. Reporting Options

Any person may make a report, including anonymously, of conduct prohibited under the SVSH Policy (“Prohibited Conduct”) to the Title IX Office. The Title IX Office is responsible for receiving and responding to reports of Prohibited Conduct.

A person may also make a report to a Responsible Employee as defined by the SVSH Policy. The SVSH Policy requires a Responsible Employee who becomes aware of an incident of Prohibited Conduct to report it to the University by contacting their location’s Title IX Officer or designee.

While there is no time limit for reporting, reports of Prohibited Conduct should be brought forward as soon as possible.
A complainant may choose to make a report to the University and may also choose to make a report to law enforcement. A complainant may pursue either or both of these options at the same time. Anyone who wishes to report to law enforcement can contact the UC Police Department at their location.

**B. Confidential Resources**
The University offers access to confidential resources for individuals who have experienced Prohibited Conduct and are seeking counseling, emotional support, or confidential information about how to make a report to the University. University Confidential Resources are defined pursuant to the SVSH Policy and include individuals who receive reports in their confidential capacity such as advocates in the CARE Office for Sexual and Gender-Based Violence and Sexual Misconduct, as well as licensed counselors (e.g., Employee Assistance Program (EAP) and Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS)), and Ombuds.

These individuals can provide confidential advice and counseling without that information being disclosed to the Title IX Office or law enforcement, unless there is a threat of serious harm to the individual or others or a legal obligation that requires disclosures (such as suspected abuse of a minor).

**II. INITIAL ASSESSMENT (Stage 1)**

Upon receipt of a report of or information about alleged Prohibited Conduct, the Title IX Officer will make an initial assessment in accordance with the SVSH Policy, which will include making an immediate assessment concerning the health and safety of the complainant and the campus community.

**A. Interim Measures**
The University will also consider and take interim measures as appropriate to ensure the safety, well-being and equal access to University programs and activities of its students and employees. Interim measures include, but are not limited to, the following: no contact orders; housing assistance; academic support; and counseling.

Investigatory leave of a PPSM-covered respondent may be imposed in accordance with PPSM 63. Investigatory leave of a non-faculty academic respondent may be imposed in accordance with APM-150.

**B. Written Rights & Options**
The Title IX Officer will ensure that the complainant, if his or her identity is known, is provided a written explanation of rights and available options as outlined in the SVSH Policy, including:

1. How and to whom to report alleged violations;
2. Options for reporting to and/or notifying law enforcement and campus authorities;
3. Information regarding confidential resources;
4. The rights of complainants regarding orders of protection, no contact orders, restraining orders, or similar lawful orders issued by criminal or civil courts;  
5. The importance of preserving evidence that may assist in proving that a criminal offense occurred or in obtaining a protection order;  
6. Counseling, health, mental health, victim advocacy, legal assistance, visa and immigration assistance, and other services available both within the institution and the community; and  
7. Options for, and available assistance to, a change to academic, living, transportation, and working situations if the complainant requests and if such options are reasonably available—regardless of whether the complainant chooses to report the crime to law enforcement.

III. INVESTIGATING AND RESOLVING REPORTS OF PROHIBITED CONDUCT (Stage 1)

Provided the University has sufficient information to respond, and in accordance with the SVSH Policy, the University may resolve reports of Prohibited Conduct by Alternative Resolution or Formal Investigation. Throughout the resolution process, the complainant and the respondent may be accompanied by an advisor. In addition, the University will offer to provide support services for complainants and for respondents.

A. Alternative Resolution
After a preliminary inquiry into the facts, the Title IX Officer may initiate an Alternative Resolution in accordance with the SVSH Policy.

B. Formal Investigation
In cases where Alternative Resolution is inappropriate or unsuccessful, the Title IX Officer may conduct a Formal Investigation as contemplated in the SVSH Policy.

1. Notification
The Title IX Officer will notify the Chancellor’s designee and the respondent’s supervisor or other appropriate administrative appointee when a Formal Investigation is commenced against a respondent. The Title IX Officer will be sensitive in their communication to protect the neutrality of the Chancellor’s designee and the neutrality of the supervisor or other appropriate administrative appointee, as well as the privacy of the complainant and respondent.

Thereafter, the Title IX Officer will ensure that the Chancellor’s designee and/or supervisor or other appropriate administrative appointee are regularly updated regarding the status of the Formal Investigation.

2. Notice of Charges
When a Formal Investigation will be conducted, the Title IX Office will send written notice of the charges to the complainant and the respondent.
The written notice will include:
   a. A summary of the allegations and potential violations of the SVSH Policy;
   b. The purpose of the investigation;
   c. A statement that the investigative report, when issued, will make factual
      findings and a determination whether there has been a violation of the SVSH
      Policy;
   d. A statement that the findings under the SVSH Policy will be based on the
      preponderance of the evidence standard;
   e. A summary of the investigation and discipline processes, including the
      expected timeline;
   f. A summary of the rights of the complainant and respondent, including the
      right to an advisor;
   g. A description of the resources available to complainant and respondent; and
   h. An admonition against intimidation or retaliation.

3. Investigative Process
   The Title IX Officer will designate an investigator to conduct a fair, thorough, and
   impartial investigation.

   a. Overview:
      During the investigation, the complainant and respondent will be provided an
      equal opportunity to meet with the investigator, submit information, and
      identify witnesses who may have relevant information.

      The investigator will meet separately with the complainant, the respondent,
      and the third party witnesses who may have relevant information, and will
      gather other available and relevant information. The investigator may follow
      up with the complainant or the respondent as needed to clarify any
      inconsistencies or new information gathered during the course of the
      investigation.

      Disclosure of facts to persons interviewed will be limited to what is
      reasonably necessary to conduct a fair and thorough investigation.
      Participants in an investigation may be asked to maintain confidentiality when
      essential to protect the integrity of the investigation.

      The complainant or the respondent may have an advisor present when
      personally interviewed and at any related meeting. Other witnesses may have
      a representative present at the discretion of the investigator or as required by
      University policy or collective bargaining agreement.

   b. Coordination with Law Enforcement:
When a law enforcement agency is conducting its own investigation into the alleged conduct, the Title IX investigator will make every effort to coordinate his or her fact-finding efforts with the law enforcement investigation. At the request of law enforcement, the investigation may be delayed temporarily to meet specific needs of the criminal investigation.

4. Investigation Report and Finding
Following conclusion of the investigation, the Title IX investigator will prepare a written report. The written investigation report will include a statement of the allegations and issues, the positions of the parties, and a summary of the evidence.

If the complainant or the respondent offered witnesses or other evidence that was not relied upon by the investigator, the investigation report will explain why it was not relied upon.

The investigation report will include findings of fact and a determination regarding whether, applying the preponderance of the evidence standard, there is sufficient evidence to conclude that respondent violated the SVSH Policy.

5. Notice of Investigation Outcome
Upon completion of the Title IX investigation report, the Title IX Officer or designee will send to the complainant and the respondent a written notice of investigation outcome regarding whether a violation of the SVSH Policy was found. The notice of investigation outcome will generally be accompanied by a copy of the investigation report, which may be redacted as necessary to protect privacy rights.

The Title IX Officer or designee will also send the notice of investigation outcome and accompanying investigation report to the Chancellor’s designee and the supervisor or other appropriate administrative authority.

The notice of investigation outcome will include:
   a. A statement of whether a preponderance of the evidence demonstrated that respondent violated the SVSH Policy;
   b. An admonition against intimidation or retaliation;
   c. An explanation of any interim measures that will remain in place;
   d. A statement that the complainant and respondent have an opportunity to respond in writing to the Chancellor’s designee and supervisor or other appropriate administrative authority; and
   e. A statement indicating whether it appears that further investigation by another appropriate body may be necessary to determine whether violations of other policies occurred, separate from any allegations of Prohibited Conduct that were investigated under the SVSH Policy.
In addition, if the investigation determined that respondent violated the SVSH Policy, the notice of investigation outcome will also include:

a. For matters involving PPSM-covered respondents, a description of the process for deciding whether and what discipline to impose, including a statement that the supervisor will propose a resolution, which may include corrective action as defined by PPSM-62 or termination in accordance with PPSM-64, and that the proposal will be subject to review and approval by the Chancellor’s designee;
b. For matters involving non-faculty academic respondents, a description of the process for deciding whether and what discipline to impose, including a statement that the supervisor or other appropriate administrative authority will propose a resolution, which may include corrective action or dismissal as described in APM-150, and that the proposal will be subject to review and approval by the Chancellor’s designee;
c. A statement that the complainant and the respondent will be informed of the final resolution of the matter, including any discipline imposed, and a statement of the anticipated timeline.

6. Timeframe for Completion of Investigation; Extension for Good Cause
The notice of investigation outcome and accompanying investigation report will be issued promptly, typically within sixty (60) business days of initiation of the Formal Investigation, unless extended by the Title IX Officer for good cause, with written notice to the complainant and the respondent of the reason for the extension and the projected new timeline.

The Title IX Officer or designee will keep the complainant and respondent regularly informed concerning the status of the investigation.

IV. ASSESSMENT AND CONSULTATION (Stage 2)

The respondent’s supervisor or other appropriate administrative authority has the responsibility to propose and implement action in response to the findings of the Title IX investigation report. The proposed decision by the supervisor or other appropriate administrative authority will be reviewed and approved by the Chancellor’s designee. The supervisor or other appropriate administrative authority may determine that additional investigation is required to determine whether violations of other policies occurred, but will not reinvestigate allegations of Prohibited Conduct investigated by the Title IX Office. The Chancellor’s designee, as well as the supervisor or other appropriate administrative authority, may consult with the Title IX Office, Staff Human Resources, or the Academic Personnel Office, or any other appropriate entities at any time during the decision-making process.

A. Opportunity to Respond
The complainant and the respondent will have an opportunity to respond to the notice of investigation outcome and accompanying investigation report through a written statement...
that will be submitted to the respondent’s supervisor or other appropriate administrative authority and the Chancellor’s designee.

The purpose of this response is not to challenge the factual findings in the Title IX investigation report or present new evidence, but to provide the complainant and the respondent with an opportunity to express their perspectives and address what outcome they wish to see.

B. Decision Proposal and Submission for Approval
In the event that the Title IX investigation finds the respondent responsible for violating the SVSH Policy, the respondent’s supervisor or other appropriate administrative authority will propose a decision regarding how to resolve the matter. The proposal must be submitted to the Chancellor’s designee for review and approval.

In the event the Chancellor’s designee does not approve the proposed decision, he or she will send it back to the supervisor or other appropriate administrative authority for reconsideration and submission of a revised proposed decision.

In the event the Chancellor’s designee approves the proposed decision, he or she will inform the supervisor or other appropriate administrative authority who will take steps to implement the approved decision.

This proposal and approval process will occur in all cases where the Title IX investigation has found the respondent has violated the SVSH Policy pursuant to these procedures. Staff Human Resources or the Academic Personnel Office will be consulted throughout the process. Additionally, the Chancellor’s designee will consult with the campus Title IX Officer on the appropriateness of the proposed discipline before approving or disapproving it.

V. CORRECTIVE OR OTHER ACTIONS (Stage 3)

A. PPSM Covered Staff: Decision Approval and Implementation
Following approval by the Chancellor’s designee, the respondent’s supervisor will implement the approved decision in accordance with applicable PPSMs, including PPSM-62 and PPSM-64.

1. No Further Action
The supervisor may propose to resolve the matter without taking any further action. This proposal will be reviewed by the Chancellor’s designee for approval. In the event it is approved, this decision and its rationale will be promptly communicated to both the complainant and the respondent.

2. Action Not Requiring Notice of Intent
The supervisor may propose corrective or remedial actions that do not amount to corrective action as defined by PPSM 62 or termination under PPSM 64. The proposed actions will be reviewed by the Chancellor’s designee for approval.

In the event it is approved, the decision will be implemented by the supervisor and the decision and its terms and rationale will be promptly communicated to both the complainant and the respondent.

3. **Notice of Intent**
   The supervisor may propose to issue a notice of intent to institute corrective action in accordance with PPSM-62 or notice of intent to terminate in accordance with PPSM-4. The proposed terms of the notice of intent will be reviewed by the Chancellor’s designee for approval. In the event it is approved, the decision will be implemented by the supervisor and the notice of intent will issued.

Following the provision of a notice of intent, corrective action will be taken in accordance with PPSM-62 and/or actions to terminate will be taken in accordance with PPSM-64. The terms of the implemented action and its rationale will be promptly communicated to both the complainant and the respondent.

**B. Non-Faculty Academic Personnel: Decision Approval and Implementation**

Following approval by the Chancellor’s designee, the respondent’s supervisor or other appropriate administrative authority will implement the approved action in accordance with APM-150.

1. **No Further Action**
   The supervisor or appropriate administrative authority may propose to resolve the matter without taking any further action. This proposal will be reviewed by the Chancellor’s designee for approval. In the event it is approved, this decision and its rationale will be promptly communicated to both the complainant and the respondent.

2. **Informal Resolution**
   The supervisor or appropriate administrative authority may propose an informal resolution in accordance with APM-150, which may include discipline and/or other corrective or remedial measures. The proposed informal resolution and its terms will be reviewed by the Chancellor’s designee for approval. Informal resolution can be achieved at any time prior to the final imposition of dismissal or corrective action.

   In the event the informal resolution is approved and agreed to by the respondent, the complainant will be promptly informed of its terms and the rationale.

3. **Notice of Intent**
   The supervisor or other appropriate administrative authority may propose to issue a notice of intent instituting dismissal or other corrective action in accordance with
APM-150. The proposed terms of the notice of intent shall be reviewed by the Chancellor’s designee for approval.

Following the provision of a notice of intent, corrective action or termination will be implemented in accordance with APM-150. The terms of the implemented action and its rationale will be promptly communicated to both the complainant and the respondent.

C. Timeframe for Implementation of Decision; Extension for Good Cause

The supervisor or other appropriate administrative authority should implement his or her approved decision promptly, typically within forty (40) business days of receipt of the notice of investigation outcome and accompanying investigation report. If the matter has not been otherwise resolved within forty (40) business days, a notice of intent will be issued.

Extensions to this timeline may be granted by the Chancellor’s designee for good cause with written notice to the complainant and the respondent stating the reason for the extension and the projected new timeline.

V. PROCESS FOLLOWING ACTION TAKEN

In the event that a PPSM-covered respondent submits a complaint under PPSM-70, or a non-faculty academic appointee respondent submits a grievance under APM-140, the Chancellor’s designee will ensure that both the complainant and the respondent receive regular updates regarding the status of the complaint or grievance.

The complainant may follow processes appropriate to their own personnel or student policies.

Subsequent to any final decision, the Chancellor’s designee will promptly inform the complainant and the respondent of the decision, including any final decision on discipline, and its rationale.