

May 10, 2017

**Sandi Glithero**

Case and Policy Coordinator, Academic Affairs

**RE:** Revisions to APM-UCD 015/016

Dear Sandi:

The proposed revisions to APM-UCD 015/016 were forwarded to all standing committees of the Davis Division of the Academic Senate. Four committees responded: Academic Personnel Oversight (CAP), Faculty Welfare, Privilege and Tenure Hearings, and Privilege and Tenure Investigative.

CAP thinks the proposed revisions are appropriate overall, but reiterated one recommendation it expressed when reviewing revisions to APM-015 in November 2016, as the recommendation is similarly relevant to APM-UCD 015. APM-015, Section III.A.3 states, "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 violation." CAP pointed out that it was unclear if this three-year period is a firm statute of limitations for disciplinary actions, and recommended clarifying the policy. If this three-year period is intended to be a guideline, CAP recommended including policies for cases when a chancellor wants to initiate disciplinary action after three years have passed.

Faculty Welfare, too, agrees with the proposed changes, but expressed concern about the confidentiality expected of accused faculty members: "On page five, there is an additional section stating that accused faculty members have an obligation of confidentiality that puts them on the same plane as investigators and Senate committee members. The committee disagrees with this level of confidentiality. If someone is accused and believes the process is treating them unfairly, they should not be bound by confidentiality about the process, but should be able to voice their concerns." In other words, Faculty Welfare thinks it is reasonable to "put the accused under limits of confidentiality about information they learn about other people through the process," but does not think this obligation of confidentiality should extend to keeping "the process itself confidential."

Finally, the Privilege and Tenure Hearings and Investigative Subcommittees both submitted a comprehensive list of recommendations, which the Davis Division recommends be read and considered carefully. Please see the enclosed responses.

The Davis Division appreciates the opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,



Rachael E. Goodhue  
Chair, Davis Division of the Academic Senate  
Professor, Agricultural and Resource Economics

Enclosed: Davis Division Committee Responses

c: Edwin M. Arevalo, Executive Director, Davis Division of the Academic Senate