Annual Report: Academic Year 2007-08
Davis Division: Academic Senate

Committee on Academic Freedom and Responsibility

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Meetings</th>
<th>Meeting frequency</th>
<th>Average hours of committee work each week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Reviewed</th>
<th>Total of reviewed deferred from the previous year</th>
<th>Total deferred to the coming academic year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Listing of bylaw changes proposed:
None

Listing of committee policies established or revised:
None

The following policies/procedures were reviewed as requested from Davis Division Academic Senate Chair and/or Systemwide Academic Senate:

- Proposal Regarding Department Faculty Clinical Duties – continued from previous year
- Proposal for Vendor Relations Guidelines
- Regulation of Non-Affiliates when on University Property
- Draft APM 710, 711, and 080
- Proposed Regulations Governing Code of Conduct for Health Sciences
- Proposal to Amend PPM 230-05 Individual Conflicts of Interest Involving Research

Recommended procedural or policy changes for the coming year:
None
Committee’s narrative:

The committee met one time during the 2007-2008 academic year, October 16, 2007. Six position reports were submitted to the Chair of the Academic Senate regarding Academic Freedom and Responsibility.

- The first report dated November 2, 2007, Guidelines for Assignment of Faculty Clinical Duties, contained two concerns with respect to the guidelines: 1) the Guidelines appear to give the Chair of the Department overly broad discretion; 2) The appeal process is inadequate.

- The second report dated November 2, 2007, concluded that the “Updated Proposal for Vendor Relations Guidelines” raises no significant academic freedom issues.

- The third report dated November 4, 2007, addressed the proposed Regulation of Non-Affiliates when on University Property. The committee found the language in the regulation overly broad in light of the fact that violation of the regulations is punishable as a misdemeanor. The committee expressed concerns that certain prohibitions and requirements for prior approval would limit academic freedom or criminalize innocent conduct.

- The fourth report dated December 10, 2007, concluded that “Draft APM 710, 711, and 080” raise no significant academic freedom issues.

- The fifth report dated April 16, 2008, concluded that Proposed Regulations Governing the Code of Conduct for Health Sciences raise no significant academic freedom issues.

- The sixth report dated April 18, 2008, Amend PPM 230-05 Individual Conflicts of Interest Involving Research, concluded generally that this proposal balances academic freedom restrictions with the necessity for research and financial integrity and other concerns. The committee, however, found some language in the proposal overly broad and made recommendations for developing criteria for the exercise of department chair discretion.

Respectfully submitted,

Albert Lin, Chair

Thomas Bills, Vitalina Komashko, Nelson Max, Joan Rowe, Shelley Lopez-Emerson (Academic Senate Support)