

The Regents of the University of California

**ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

January 21, 2026

The Academic and Student Affairs Committee met on the above date at the UCLA Luskin Conference Center, Los Angeles campus.

Members present: Regents Anguiano, Batchlor, Brooks, Hernandez, Leib, Myers, Park, Sarris, and Wang; Ex officio members Milliken, Reilly, and Thurmond; Advisory members Melton, Palazoglu, Scott, and Tokita; Chancellors Frenk, Hu, and Larive; Staff Advisor Frías

In attendance: Regent-designate Craven, Staff Advisor Hanson, Secretary and Chief of Staff Lyall, General Counsel Robinson, Provost Newman, Senior Vice President Turner, Vice Presidents Brown and Kao, Chancellors Assanis, Hawgood, May, and Muñoz, and Recording Secretary Li

The meeting convened at 1:45 p.m. with Committee Chair Leib presiding.

Committee Chair Leib shared that he and Regents Park, Reilly, Anguiano, Hernandez, Lee, and Wang toured seven campuses over the past year to learn about the progress the University has made toward implementing the recommendations set forth by the Regents Working Group on Innovation Transfer and Entrepreneurship. Regents met with chancellors, campus leadership, and more than 40 faculty inventors and founders of start-up companies, and 40 student inventors and entrepreneurs. Committee Chair Leib highlighted three findings from these visits. First, many students applied to and enrolled at UC with aspirations of entrepreneurship or working at a start-up company. Second, chancellors underscored the need for a permanent, systemwide Proof-of-Concept fund. Typically, grants of \$50,000 to \$125,000 were given to help students and faculty members further their ideas, furthering commercialization and technology transfer on campuses. Third, by decentralizing innovation and entrepreneurship (I&E), campuses were empowered to exercise authority over their I&E activities. Committee Chair Leib stressed the importance of maintaining dialogue, exploration, and strategic thinking to reduce the distance between the University's laboratories and the marketplace. At a future meeting, some of the projects funded by the Proof-of-Concept monies would be featured as part of the "UC Inspires" series.

**1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of November 19, 2025 were approved, Regents Anguiano, Brooks, Hernandez, Leib, Milliken, Myers, Park, Reilly, Sarris, and Wang voting "aye."<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Roll call vote required by the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act [Government Code §11123(b)(1)(D)] for all meetings held by teleconference.

**2. APPROVAL OF MULTI-YEAR PLANS FOR PROFESSIONAL DEGREE SUPPLEMENTAL TUITION FOR THREE GRADUATE PROFESSIONAL DEGREE PROGRAMS**

The President of the University recommended that the Academic and Student Affairs Committee recommend that the Regents approve the multi-year plans for charging Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) for three graduate professional degree programs as shown in Display 1.

**DISPLAY 1: Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition Levels<sup>1</sup> for Three Programs**

	<b>Proposed Level</b>				
	<u>2026-27</u>	<u>2027-28</u>	<u>2028-29</u>	<u>2029-30</u>	<u>2030-31</u>
<b>Design Media Arts (MFA), Los Angeles</b>					
Resident PDST Level	\$9,000	\$9,270	\$9,600	\$9,888	\$10,200
Nonresident PDST Level	\$9,000	\$9,270	\$9,600	\$9,888	\$10,200
<b>Music (MM), Los Angeles</b>					
Resident PDST Level	\$10,701	\$11,022	\$11,352	\$11,691	\$12,042
Nonresident PDST Level	\$10,701	\$11,022	\$11,352	\$11,691	\$12,042
<b>Urban and Regional Planning (MURP), San Diego</b>					
Resident PDST Level	\$7,500	\$7,500	\$7,875	\$8,268	\$8,682
Nonresident PDST Level	\$7,500	\$7,500	\$7,875	\$8,268	\$8,682

<sup>1</sup> The amounts reflect the maximum PDST levels to be assessed, effective as of the academic year indicated. Assessing PDST levels less than the level indicated requires approval by the President with the concurrence of the Chancellor.

[Background material was provided to Regents in advance of the meeting, and a copy is on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Committee Chair Leib invited Student Observer Teesha Sreeram to make remarks regarding this item.

Ms. Sreeram acknowledged the programmatic needs of these programs charging Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) and the financial pressure that academic departments faced but called attention to the impact that raising PDST would have on affordability, access, and long-term equity across the University system. Graduate and professional students were already navigating rising tuition, escalating housing and living costs, and limited grant-based financial aid. For many students, particularly those from low-income, first-generation, and underrepresented backgrounds, supplemental tuition could be a deciding factor in whether they apply, enroll, or complete their degree. Often, financial aid does not fully offset PDST increases, and students frequently rely on additional borrowing. Recent federal government changes to the way professional programs are defined and treated have created uncertainty regarding financial aid eligibility, loan structures, and institutional accountability. Approving multi-year PDST plans under these circumstances exposed students to additional risk. Proposed plans had fewer opportunities for annual review, student input, and reassessment in response to changing economic and policy conditions. Graduate students were being asked to make long-term financial commitments without the promise of future federal or institutional aid

structures. Consultation with students and faculty regarding these PDST proposals was not sufficient; students needed meaningful protection, an enforceable commitment to affordability, and transparency about the use of PDST revenues and financial aid increases. Otherwise, there was a risk that PDST would become a default funding mechanism rather than a carefully limited exception. If the Regents approve these plans, Ms. Sreeram asked the Regents to require strong guarantees that costs would be fully covered for students with demonstrated financial need; to mandate regular public reporting on PDST revenue, aid distribution, and student outcomes; and to reconsider the use of multi-year plans. UC's public mission depended on maintaining access to graduate and professional education for students from all backgrounds. Ms. Sreeram urged the Regents to proceed with caution and to prioritize affordability, equity, and student well-being in their decision-making.

Provost Newman responded that UC took graduate student consultation very seriously. Proposals for increasing PDST often came from students, because they sought additional services and recognized that PDST as one of the most critical sources of support. The University shared concerns about changes to federal loan programs, and the Office of Federal Governmental Relations was working hard to advocate on behalf of students. When raising funds through PDST, UC sought to maximally return support to students with the most demonstrated need, enabling access and relieving as many costs as possible. The proposed plans were multi-year because planning for programs took multiple years and students enrolled for multiple years; thus, annual approval was often not sufficient for adequate planning. The programs being presented have all committed to waiving PDST for students who are eligible for the Native American Opportunity Plan.

Kate Glassman, Director of Operating Budget at the Office of the President (UCOP) introduced the item, the approval of multi-year PDST plans for three graduate professional degree programs: the Master of Urban and Regional Planning (MURP) at UC San Diego, the Master of Fine Arts (MFA) in the Department of Design Media Arts at UCLA, and the Master of Music (MM) at UCLA. Each program sought to establish PDST. MURP at UCSD was a new program, and UCLA's MFA and MM were existing programs. UCOP staff worked closely with campus representatives in a highly iterative process to review these proposals and ensure that each presents strategies to maintain instructional quality and student academic support, minimize program costs and student debt obligations, support student public service ambitions, demonstrate effective student consultation, and advance inclusiveness. All three proposals fully complied with the requirements of Regents Policy 3103: Policy on Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition.

Mirle Rabinowitz Bussell, Chair of the UC San Diego Department of Urban Studies and Planning, stated that PDST would be charged when the first cohort of students enters the Master of Urban and Regional Planning program in fall 2027, and the program sought earlier approval to support planning, marketing, and outreach. MURP was a new, two-year program for city and regional planners with three distinguishing features: a focus on social justice and its relationship with urban planning, training all students in climate change mitigation adaptation, and leveraging the San Diego/Tijuana region as a living and learning studio for cross-national planning, research, and design. The program planned to enroll 15 students in year one and expand to 50 students by year four. The proposed initial PDST

was \$7,500, with five percent annual increases through 2030–31. The program’s total cost for California residents would be on par with that of its public comparators, and 40 percent of PDST revenue would be return-to-aid, the majority of which would go toward need-based awards. PDST would go toward hiring practitioners as lecturers, thereby reducing the student-to-faculty ratio and ensuring that students acquire the latest skills and knowledge. PDST and philanthropic gifts would help fund an industry relations staff member, who would provide career readiness services and track career outcomes. PDST would also support outreach efforts and student attendance at professional conferences.

Lionel Popkin, Interim Dean of the UCLA School of Arts and Architecture, stated that the UCLA Department of Design Media Arts (DMA) MFA program offered graduate education in the disciplines of design, games, interactive art, and computational art. Graduates had careers as educators, artists, entrepreneurs, designers, game inventors, and executives in software and technology companies. With PDST, this three-year program planned to grow its cohort from seven to nine students per cohort, for a total of 27 students, and planned to focus on California resident enrollment. PDST would be established at \$9,000 in 2026–27, with annual, inflation-based increases through 2030–31; PDST would be covered for existing students in order to avoid imposing a mid-degree fee. The DMA MFA program, which offered individualized mentoring and instruction, sought to maintain its high academic quality in a challenging budgetary environment. The program was in a young, complex, and growing field in which emerging technology was expensive and changed rapidly. Aging facilities and outdated technology could compromise the program’s high standards and competitive edge, and personnel costs tended to exceed inflation. As a result of student and faculty feedback, the program changed its curriculum from two to three years to ensure sufficient time for students to train, practice, and prepare for the specialization and technical demands of the media arts landscape.

Regent Park noted the significant difference between the number of applicants and the number of enrollees and asked how the DMA MFA program arrived at such a cohort size. Eddo Stern, Chair of the Department of Design Media Arts at UCLA, responded that the program was small, on par with similarly sized programs. The field demanded a small cohort, and the DMA MFA program offered a high level of attention to its students, with individualized mentorship, specialized laboratories, and seminars.

Regent Park asked if the decrease in the enrollment of international students could be attributed to a change in outreach or the low enrollment numbers generally. Mr. Stern responded that it could be attributed to both increased outreach to domestic students and the small size of the program.

Regent Park noted that underrepresented students seemed more interested in the program. Mr. Stern responded in the affirmative, adding that the program would continue outreach. Regent Park asked for insight into the field and its importance to industry. Mr. Stern replied that there was pressure for the program to grow alongside a field that was changing with the emergence of new technologies, job opportunities, and career paths, but the department sought to preserve the quality of the program with an approach of “small growth.”

Regent Anguiano asked if continuing education for professionals was a consideration for the program. Mr. Stern replied that this was an issue of curricular vision and approach. The program taught students how to absorb, build, and creatively use new technologies rather than training students in the use of tools that would become obsolete. The program did not currently offer continuing education, but it was being considered.

Regent Sarris remarked that the intensive nature of the program precluded it from being offered as ongoing education. Mr. Stern expressed agreement. It would be difficult to provide such a program in a non-degree-granting format.

Regent Myers asked the presenters what they would change or improve in the program. Mr. Stern replied that the program changed often, always adjusting to changes in the field and constantly assessing technologies and artistic media.

Regent Myers asked if the changing nature of the field affected pedagogy. Mr. Stern reiterated that, rather than teaching the use of a particular tool, teaching engagement with new technologies was valuable, long-term education.

Regent Park noted that the program was adding a third year at a time when the University sought to streamline as a way to reduce costs but also noted the unique nature of the program, which was in high demand and offered limited places. Regent Park expressed appreciation for the program's continued attention to return-to-aid.

James Bass, Chair of the UCLA Department of Music Performance, Education and Composition, stated that the Herb Alpert School of Music at UCLA, in which the Department was housed, was the only professional music school in the UC system that offered individual mentorship with world-renowned scholars and performers. The two-year Master of Music program enrolled roughly 50 students each year, and its curriculum featured intensive, one-on-one instruction, specialized studio teaching, ensemble performance, and small graduate seminars that were both resource-intensive and central to program quality and for student success. PDST was proposed at \$10,701 in 2026–27, with a three percent annual increase through 2030–31, and would be fully offset for continuing and mid-degree students. By assessing PDST, the program sought to maintain excellence, access, and competitiveness amid rising costs in a difficult budgetary climate; enhance student financial aid; support students' conference attendance and travel for performances, which would help students obtain future employment; and create a new career guidance counselor position that would provide professional preparation, postgraduate mentoring, and outcomes tracking. The proposed PDST would also help the program maintain a low student-to-faculty ratio. Both the program and the proposal were shaped through extensive consultation with students and faculty.

Regent Myers asked what the program learned from the extensive consultation. Mr. Bass replied that program representatives met with graduate student leaders to explain PDST and the program's intentions, and feedback from student leaders was incorporated into a town hall meeting with the full graduate student body and a survey. The general consensus from students was positive, especially with regard to enhancements resulting from PDST.

Regent Wang shared what students had conveyed to Regents during a recent breakfast meeting. First, students asked that a holistic approach be taken when considering the financial impact of PDST on students. Second, students called for reporting within a year on the effect of tuition increases on student outcomes. Third, students asked that affordability comparisons be based on net cost, not gross, in light of different types of financial support for different programs.

Regent Park encouraged the University to revert to the previous template for the PDST item as it contained more information that helped the Regents consider these proposals holistically and historically. In addition to voting on PDST plans, Regents were also discussing a range of topics, including what was happening in fields and sectors. Having complete information would enable the fullest discussion.

Regent Park acknowledged the uniqueness of the Master of Music program within the University and the importance of maintaining its quality and stature but stressed the need to be cost-conscious and to ensure that PDST is used to benefit students rather than make up for what UC should cover.

Regent Brooks noted that Ms. Newman was leading an effort to determine whether UC degrees matched workforce needs. She asked how many graduates from the program were able to obtain lucrative employment in a relevant field. Mr. Bass responded that the master's degree expanded on a broad-based undergraduate education in music. The program's intense training helped students reach virtuosity and the threshold of employment. As in most markets, job openings ebbed and flowed, but the program sought to prepare students for jobs as soon as they became available.

Regent Brooks asked about the role of PDST in helping the program offer career counseling. Mr. Bass stated that the program did not currently have the financial resources to hire a counselor, and both students and faculty expressed a desire for such a position. In the proposed plan, the counselor would maintain a relationship with students for at least one year after graduation, assist students with making connections, and track information so that the program could more finely tune its curriculum.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the President's recommendation and voted to present it to the Board, Regents Anguiano, Batchlor, Brooks, Hernandez, Leib, Milliken, Myers, Park, Reilly, Sarris, and Wang voting "aye" and Regent Thurmond voting "no."

3. **AMENDMENT OF ACADEMIC PERSONNEL MANUAL SECTIONS 015 AND 016: THE FACULTY CODE OF CONDUCT AND UNIVERSITY POLICY ON FACULTY CONDUCT AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF DISCIPLINE AND REPORT ON SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW OF FACULTY DISCIPLINE PROCEDURES**

The President of the University recommended that the Academic and Student Affairs Committee recommend to the Regents the amendment of Academic Personnel Manual

Section 015: The Faculty Code of Conduct, as shown in Attachment 1, and Section 016, University Policy on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline, as shown in Attachment 2, effective no later than March 1, 2026, or as soon as other conforming processes can be implemented.

[Background material was provided to Regents in advance of the meeting, and a copy is on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Committee Chair Leib thanked Provost Newman, Faculty Representative Palazoglu, members of the joint workgroup of the Academic Senate and University administration, and Regents Anguiano and Sarris for their partnership in this effort. The proposed revisions to the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) were reviewed systemwide, and changes were made based on the input received.

Ms. Newman thanked the hundreds of UC faculty members who provided input. This consultation gave her confidence that the recommendation represented the views of faculty, who were essential to the disciplinary process. Ms. Newman recalled that the University had received a directive to conduct a comprehensive review to ensure that its expressive activities policies complied with the California Budget Act of 2024, or State Senate Bill (SB) 108. There had also been concerns that faculty conduct policies and procedures might be overly protracted or inconsistently applied across UC campuses. The joint Academic Senate-Administration workgroup produced policy amendments to address these concerns and to continue UC's institutional improvement and shared governance practices. The workgroup had two primary objectives: first, to increase the efficiency of the discipline process and thereby reduce the time taken to resolve cases, and second, to promote consistent application of discipline across the campuses. These policies attempted to balance due process with the timely resolution of cases while leaning on the leadership of faculty, who held each other to high standards of performance and ethical behavior. The workgroup engaged in very productive interchanges with Regents on this Committee, and extensive consultation with faculty produced some 400 pages of responses. The results were presented to the Academic Council for endorsement and then the Assembly of the Academic Senate for review and approval. The amended revisions to the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) were approved on January 15.

Monica Varsanyi, Vice Provost of Faculty Affairs and Academic Programs, summarized the proposed amendments to APM - 015, the Faculty Code of Conduct, and APM - 016, University Policy on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline. Firstly, initial assessments, investigations, and investigation reports; the filing of disciplinary charges, and extensions for good cause would be required to occur within shorter time frames. Secondly, a Systemwide Reserve Privilege and Tenure Pool, composed of members from other campus Divisions of the Academic Senate, would be established to supplement campus hearing committees should a full committee not be able to meet. The proposed time frame in APM - 015 for the completion of disciplinary cases, which was presented at the May 2025 meeting, has remained the same following systemwide review: 30 business days for an initial assessment, 120 business days for the completion of the investigation and the investigation report, and 40 business days within which to file disciplinary charges.

The APM did not currently have specified time frames associated with these steps in the disciplinary process. Faculty, the administration, and others in the UC community expressed concerns about these time frames in relation to investigations under other policies, such as the whistleblower policy, which had a longer period for completion. In those cases, good cause extensions would remain available if another policy required a different deadline for completion.

Also, at the May 2025 meeting, there was discussion of the recommendation to establish a Systemwide Network Privilege and Tenure (P&T) Committee if the campus' P&T hearing committee is not appointed within 14 days. Based on systemwide feedback, the APM would be amended to follow the Academic Council's recommendation of establishing a Systemwide Reserve Privilege and Tenure Pool. The Reserve P&T Pool would be coordinated by the Academic Senate's University Committee on Privilege and Tenure (UCPT) and comprise faculty such as former P&T members, senior faculty, and emeriti faculty. It would make a larger roster of experienced faculty available to serve on a hearing committee and was modeled after an existing structure in the Academic Senate that was proven successful. A campus could either draw from the Reserve P&T Pool to complete a hearing panel, or UCPT could coordinate a special committee composed of members from other Divisions of the Academic Senate, in a process already found in Senate Bylaw 336. Current policy did not specify a deadline for full hearing committee appointments; under the proposed revision, a full hearing committee must be appointed no later than 50 calendar days from the date disciplinary charges are filed.

Faculty Representative Palazoglu stated that, if the Regents approve the amendments to APM - 015 and APM - 016, the Academic Senate would amend Academic Senate Bylaw 336 to reflect the time frames shown in the presentation slides. There would be specific milestones within the 60-day pre-hearing time frame allowed under Senate Bylaw 336, culminating in the appointment of the hearing committee drawn partially or fully from the Reserve P&T Pool. Comments received during the 90-day systemwide review reflected the wisdom and value of shared governance and included robust feedback from the Academic Council, the Assembly of the Academic Senate, the UCPT workgroup led by committee chair Susan Amussen from UC Merced, and faculty experts on academic freedom and free speech. What resulted was a set of amended policies and guidelines that met the ultimate goal of streamlining the faculty discipline process while preserving faculty self-governance, allowing for due process rights and ensuring academic freedom.

Following the amendment of APM - 015 and APM - 016, the interim systemwide faculty discipline guidelines issued in June 2025 would be revised and reissued. Then President Drake had originally charged Ms. Newman with establishing a joint Academic Senate–Administration workgroup to make recommendations related to UC's compliance with the State Budget Act of 2024, or SB 108, and to determine if UC policies needed to be revised to cover expressive activities. Although the joint workgroup found that UC policies covering expressive activities were capacious, it recommended systemwide guidelines on calibrating disciplinary actions. Because of feedback from systemwide review, these guidelines were revised to clarify the proposed language. They clarified that the guidelines would apply only after a finding of a policy violation, explained the purpose of mitigating

and aggravating factors, and included more precise language about the application of sanctions. Two sections were added to the companion document, which was intended to clarify expressive activity and disciplinary sanctions. First was a statement about extramural speech and academic freedom reflecting current policies, principles, and procedures in APM - 010, and second was a list of policies related to expressive activities that, if violated, would cause the P&T committee and chancellor or chancellor's designee to use the guidelines for calibrating discipline. Every year, UC campuses averaged seven to eight faculty misconduct investigations, and a heavy workload was associated with these cases. This included upholding due process by ensuring that all appropriate witnesses are interviewed and relevant documents are produced and reviewed. The systemwide guidelines were also intended to promote systemwide consistency in assessing what constitutes good-cause factors for time extensions. In the future, the Academic Senate and administration would continue to collaborate on further systemwide guidance, and a new joint workgroup would develop draft guidelines and a set of frequently asked questions (FAQs) on what constitutes a policy violation related to excessive activities. A 90-day systemwide review of additional guidelines and related materials would occur in late spring 2026, and the systemwide guidelines and FAQs would be issued in summer 2026 and presented to the Regents at the September meeting.

Ms. Newman expressed belief that, following the 90-day systemwide review and robust feedback received, UC has addressed the issues of reducing the time spent in the faculty disciplinary process and consistent application of discipline while remaining grounded in shared governance. She expressed gratitude to the UC community, especially faculty.

Regent Park asked whether there is a limit to the length of a good cause extension or the number of extensions a faculty member could receive. Ms. Newman replied in the negative, but one change was that chancellors would report on good cause extensions, giving the University data that could be examined. Regent Park encouraged UC to continue monitoring this to determine whether good cause is appropriately used and limited.

Referring to the written materials, Regent Park asked if the three tiers of policy violations were created in the review process or drawn from something that already existed. Deputy Provost Amy Lee replied that the three tiers were developed by the joint Academic Senate–Administration workgroup, which adjusted existing guidelines for disciplinary sanctions in sexual violence/sexual harassment cases to reflect expressive activities. The workgroup was also guided by time, place, and manner policies and the Faculty Code of Conduct.

Regent Park asked for a future update on how these tiers are used in practice. Committee Chair Leib agreed that the Regents should receive an update in one or more years.

Regent Anguiano thanked the Academic Senate for its commitment to robust systemwide input and a streamlined process. This was a great example of shared governance done well.

Regent Kounalakis underscored that this effort arose from a particularly troubling incident. She acknowledged the University as a pillar of free speech and the hard work of creating a process to address inappropriate behavior.

Regent Sarris stated that participating in this effort gave him hope for the effectiveness of shared governance.

Regent Reilly expressed appreciation for the chance to see shared governance in action and thanked the Faculty Representatives, the Office of the President, Ms. Newman, Committee Chair Leib, and Regents Anguiano and Sarris. She looked forward to the future update.

Committee Chair Leib recalled that a past case had demonstrated problems in the faculty disciplinary process. He commended Ms. Newman for proposing a systemwide P&T hearing committee and praised Mr. Palazoglu for his partnership.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the President's recommendation and voted to present it to the Board, Regents Anguiano, Batchlor, Brooks, Hernandez, Leib, Milliken, Park, Reilly, Sarris, Thurmond, and Wang voting "aye."

The meeting adjourned at 2:50 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff

GENERAL UNIVERSITY POLICY  
REGARDING ACADEMIC APPOINTEES  
The Faculty Code of Conduct

DRAFT  
APM - 015

**DRAFT - General University Policy Regarding Academic Appointees: APM - 015 - The Faculty Code of Conduct**

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, May 28, 2003, June 12, 2013, ~~and~~ February 8, 2017, and Month DD, 2026, and by The Regents on July 18, 1986, May 15, 1987, June 19, 1992, November 15, 2001, July 17, 2003, July 18, 2013, ~~and~~ March 15, 2017, and Month DD, 2026. In addition, technical changes were made September 1, 1988, June 11, 2010, and September 23, 2020.

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, 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 when acting as a member of the faculty 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, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender, gender expression, gender identity, ethnic origin, national origin, ancestry, marital status, pregnancy, physical or mental disability, medical condition (cancer-related or genetic characteristics), genetic information (including family medical history), or service in the uniformed services as defined by the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994 (USERRA), as well as state military and naval service, or, within the limits imposed by law or University regulations, because of age or citizenship or for other arbitrary or personal reasons.
  3. Sexual violence and sexual harassment, as defined by University policy, of a student.
  4. Violation of the University policy, including the pertinent guidelines, applying to nondiscrimination against students on the basis of disability.
  5. 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.
  6. Participating in or deliberately abetting disruption, interference, or intimidation in the classroom.
  7. 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<sup>1</sup>, academic responsibility (instructional, evaluative, or supervisory).

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

8. Exercising academic responsibility (instructional, evaluative, or supervisory) for any student with whom a faculty member has a romantic or sexual relationship.

## 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 or individuals seeking employment; providing services pursuant to a contract; or applying for or engaged in an unpaid internship, volunteer capacity, or training program leading to employment on political grounds, or for reasons of race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender, gender expression, gender identity, ethnic origin, national origin, ancestry, marital status, pregnancy, physical or mental disability, medical condition (cancer-related or genetic characteristics), genetic information (including family medical history), or service in the uniformed services as defined by the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994 (USERRA), as well as state military and naval service, or, within the limits imposed by law or University regulations, because of age or citizenship or for other arbitrary or personal reasons.
6. Sexual violence and sexual harassment, as defined by University policy, of another member of the University community.
7. Violation of the University policy, including the pertinent guidelines, applying to nondiscrimination against employees on the basis of disability.
8. 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, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender, gender expression, gender

- identity, ethnic origin, national origin, ancestry, marital status, pregnancy, physical or mental disability, medical condition (cancer-related or genetic characteristics), genetic information (including family medical history), or service in the uniformed services as defined by the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994 (USERRA), as well as state military and naval service, or, within the limits imposed by law or University regulations, because of age or citizenship or for other arbitrary or personal reasons.
3. Sexual violence and sexual harassment, as defined by University policy, of another member of the University community.
  4. Violation of the University policy, including the pertinent guidelines, applying to nondiscrimination against faculty on the basis of disability.
  5. 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 or Special Committee convened pursuant to Academic Senate Bylaw 336 (hereafter, the "Hearing Committee"), ~~and~~ subsequent to a filing of a charge by the appropriate administrative officer, ~~as described in Academic Senate Bylaw 336~~.
  3. The Chancellor is deemed to know about an alleged violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct when it is reported to any academic administrator at the level of department chair or above. Additionally, for 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. 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. There is no limit on the time within which a complainant may report an alleged violation.
  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 the accused faculty member explicitly waives the 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 Hearing~~ 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 in the Academic Senate Bylaw 336 be developed that allow each Divisional Committee on Privilege and Tenure to sit in hearing panels smaller than the full committee. The University Committee on Privilege and Tenure will establish and coordinate a Systemwide Reserve Privilege and Tenure Pool. The Systemwide Privilege and Tenure Pool may constitute part or all of the Hearing Committee, depending on the circumstances.
  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. The following deadlines should be adhered to, unless the timeframes associated with specific policies or campus procedures require a different timeframe (e.g., the University policy on sexual violence and sexual harassment requires that an investigation be concluded within 60 to 90 business days) or there is an extension for good cause:
    - (a) Upon receipt of a report of an alleged Faculty Code of Conduct violation, an initial assessment, including a limited inquiry when appropriate to determine how to proceed, should be completed within 30 business days following receipt of the report;-
    - (b) The investigation and the investigation report should be completed within 120 business days following the notice of investigation to the parties; and
    - (c) Disciplinary charges should be filed by the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee within 40 business days of receipt of the investigation outcome.

- ~~4.5.~~ 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. 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 Hearing~~ Committee ~~on Privilege and Tenure~~ prior to finalizing the settlement.
- ~~5.6.~~ 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.
- ~~6.7.~~ 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.
- ~~7.8.~~ 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~~ Consistent with Academic Senate Bylaw 336, unless extended for good cause, 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 no later than 60 calendar days from the date disciplinary charges are filed with the Committee on Privilege and Tenure. The chair of the Hearing Committee will be appointed within 14 calendar days of receipt of the disciplinary charges. The full Hearing Committee, whether drawn from the Systemwide Reserve Privilege and Tenure Pool or not, shall be appointed according to Academic Senate Bylaw 336, and no later than 50 calendar days from the date disciplinary charges are filed.~~ 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.
- ~~8.9.~~ 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.
- ~~10.~~ 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.

9.11. Pursuant to Academic Senate Bylaw 336, “good cause” consists of material or unforeseen circumstances sufficient to justify the extension sought.

### **Revision History**

#### Month DD, 2026:

- Substantive revisions to incorporate the recommendation to establish a Systemwide Reserve Privilege and Tenure Pool, coordinated by the University Committee on Privilege and Tenure.
- Substantive revisions to incorporate timeframes for completion of initial assessments, investigations and investigation reports, and the filing of disciplinary charges, as well as extensions for good cause.
- Substantive revisions to reflect a deadline for the appointment of the full Hearing Committee.
- Technical revisions to reflect conforming language with, and timeframes specified in, Academic Senate Bylaw 336.

#### September 23, 2020:

- Technical revision to remove gendered language.

For details on prior revisions, please visit the [policy issuance web page](#) ~~[Academic Personnel and Programs website](#)~~.

GENERAL UNIVERSITY POLICY  
REGARDING ACADEMIC APPOINTEES  
University Policy on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline

DRAFT  
APM - 016

**DRAFT - General University Policy Regarding Academic Appointees: APM - 016 - University Policy on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline**

**University Policy on Faculty Conduct and  
The Administration of Discipline**

The University policy on faculty conduct and the administration of discipline is set forth in its entirety in this policy and in the Faculty Code of Conduct.

**Section I -- Introduction and General  
Policy**

This policy, as recommended by the President of the University and approved by The Regents on June 14, 1974, November 15, 2001, ~~and~~ March 15, 2017, and Month DD, 2026, supersedes the President's interim statement on the same subject, issued on January 15, 1971. The present policy is to be read in conjunction with the Faculty Code of Conduct.

The Faculty Code of Conduct is set forth in [APM - 015](#). Part I of the Faculty Code of Conduct notes the responsibility of the administration to preserve conditions that protect and encourage the faculty in its central pursuits. Part II defines normative conditions for faculty conduct and sets forth types of unacceptable faculty conduct subject to University discipline. Part III makes recommendations and proposes guidelines to ~~assure~~ensure the development of fair procedures for enforcing the Code.

Nothing in the Faculty Code of Conduct, or in this policy, is intended to change the various authorities and responsibilities of the Academic Senate, the administration, and The Regents as currently set forth in The Regents' Bylaws, the policies and regulations of the University, and the Bylaws and Regulations of the Academic Senate.

The Faculty Code of Conduct explicitly does not deal with policies, procedures, or possible sanctions pertaining to strikes by members of the faculty. These are covered by Regental and administrative policies external to the Code.

Except for the matter of strikes, and with recognition that Part III of the Faculty Code of Conduct consists of mandatory principles and recommendations to the Divisions of the Academic Senate and the campus administrations, the Faculty Code of Conduct, as set forth in [APM - 015](#), is the official basis for imposing discipline on members of the faculty for professional misconduct.

With respect to the imposition of disciplinary sanctions, the Faculty Code of Conduct deals only with the professional responsibilities, ethical principles, and standards of conduct that pertain to the professional obligations of faculty members. No disciplinary sanctions described in this policy may be imposed on faculty members other than through the procedures pursuant to this policy and the

GENERAL UNIVERSITY POLICY  
REGARDING ACADEMIC APPOINTEES  
University Policy on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline

DRAFT  
APM - 016

Faculty Code of Conduct. In addition, faculty members may be subject to certain administrative actions which are outside the scope of faculty discipline. For example, like all other members of the University community, faculty members are subject to the general rules and regulations of the University such as those pertaining to parking, library privileges, health and safety, and use of University facilities. Faculty are subject to appropriate administrative actions for failure to comply with such rules and regulations. Another example applies to faculty members serving in administrative appointments who are subject to administrative actions for misconduct in their role as administrators. Faculty members serving in administrative roles may be subject to disciplinary sanctions under this policy in addition to administrative actions, if the faculty member's misconduct in the role of an administrator also violates the ethical and professional standards for faculty set forth in the Faculty Code of Conduct.

To maintain consistency in the future between the Faculty Code of Conduct, if it should be further amended by the Academic Senate, and any new or changed Regental or administrative policies relating to faculty conduct that might be adopted, the President will consult with appropriate agencies of the Academic Senate, and will undertake to facilitate any needed joint action by the Senate and The Regents or the administration.

Authority for discipline derives from The Regents. The Regents have made the Chancellor of each campus responsible for discipline on the campus ([Regents' Bylaw 31](#)), subject to certain procedures and safeguards involving the President and the Academic Senate ([Regents' Bylaws 30, 31, and 40](#)).

This policy regarding faculty discipline requires a spirit of active cooperation between the administration, as embodied by the Chancellor, and the Academic Senate. In case of disagreement between the administration and the faculty over the interpretation or application of the Faculty Code of Conduct, conflicts will be resolved on a case-by-case basis, with the fullest consideration given to peer judgments achieved through procedures for discipline. In cases where a Chancellor's tentative decision regarding the imposition of discipline on a faculty member disagrees with the recommendation of the Divisional Committee on Privilege and Tenure or Special Committee (hereafter, the "Hearing Committee") as described in Academic Senate Bylaw 336, the Chancellor shall inform the Chair of the Committee ~~on Privilege and Tenure~~ in writing that the Chancellor may disagree and ask if the Chair would like the Chancellor to meet with the Chair or with the whole committee prior to making a final decision or recommendation.

Disciplinary action is to be distinguished from certain other administrative actions taken as the result, not of willful misconduct but rather, for example, of disability or incompetence. The administration naturally bears the responsibility of assuring that the University's resources are used productively and appropriately. In meeting this responsibility, administrators must occasionally take actions which resemble certain disciplinary sanctions but which are actually of an entirely different character. These actions are subject to separate procedures with due process guarantees and should

not be confused with disciplinary action with its implications of culpability and sanction. [APM - 075](#) on Termination for Incompetent Performance articulates the conditions under which faculty members with tenure or security of employment may be terminated for incompetent performance.

## **Section II -- Types of Disciplinary Sanctions**

The types of discipline that may be imposed on a member of the faculty are as follows, in order of increasing severity: written censure, reduction in salary, demotion, suspension, denial or curtailment of emeritus status, and dismissal from the employ of the University. In any disciplinary proceeding, the Chancellor may not impose a type of discipline more severe than that which was set forth in a written notice of proposed disciplinary action to the faculty member. The Chancellor may impose additional appropriate remedial or corrective sanctions not set forth in this Code only with the consent of the accused faculty member. More than one disciplinary sanction may be imposed for a single act of misconduct, e.g. a letter of censure and a suspension. The Chancellor may remove or terminate a sanction, either automatically or by administrative discretion, in individual cases. The severity and type of discipline selected for a particular offense must be appropriately related to the nature and circumstances of the case.

### **1. Written Censure**

A formal written expression of institutional rebuke that contains a brief description of the censured conduct, conveyed by the Chancellor. Written censure is to be distinguished from an informal written or spoken warning, and must be delivered confidentially to the recipient and maintained in a designated personnel file or files indefinitely or for a lesser period of time specified in the writing. Informal written or spoken warning is not an official disciplinary action.

### **2. Reduction in Salary**

Reduction to lower salary without change in rank or step. The authority to reduce the salary of any faculty member rests with the Chancellor. This authority may not be redelegated. The amount and duration of the reduced salary shall be specified.

### **3. Demotion**

Reduction to lower rank or step with corresponding reduction in salary. Demotion as a disciplinary action should be imposed in a manner consistent with the merit based system for advancement. Generally, demotion is an appropriate sanction when the misconduct is relevant to the academic advancement process of the faculty member. The authority to reduce the rank of a faculty member who does not have tenure or security of employment

rests with the Chancellor. The authority to reduce, within rank, the step of any faculty member to a lower step rests with the Chancellor. This authority may not be redelegated.

Authority for demoting a faculty member with tenure or with security of employment to a lower rank, also with tenure or with security of employment, rests with the President, on recommendation of the Chancellor. Demotion of a faculty member with tenure or with security of employment to a lower rank without tenure or security of employment is not an option.

#### 4. **Suspension**

Suspension of a faculty member without pay for some stated period of time from the continuance of the appointment on its normal terms. Unless otherwise noted, the terms of a suspension will include loss of normal faculty privileges such as access to University property, participation in departmental governance, voting rights, administration of grants, supervision of graduate students, and use of University administrative staff, and may include loss of other campus privileges such as parking and library privileges. The degree and duration of the suspension shall be specified.

Authority for the suspension of a faculty member rests with the Chancellor and may not be redelegated. Suspension as a disciplinary action is to be distinguished from involuntary leave, which is a precautionary action.

#### 5. **Denial or Curtailment of Emeritus Status**

Denial or curtailment of current or future emeritus status of a faculty member, including the privileges associated with the emeritus status. The denial or curtailment of emeritus status does not affect the faculty member's entitlement to earned retirement benefits. Authority for the denial or curtailment of emeritus status of a faculty member rests with the President, on recommendation of the Chancellor.

#### 6. **Dismissal from the Employ of the University**

The Chancellor has authority to dismiss a faculty member who does not have tenure or security of employment. This authority may not be redelegated. 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.

Prior to the imposition of any disciplinary sanction(s) as described above, the Chancellor may waive or limit any or all disciplinary sanction(s) on the condition that the accused faculty member performs some specified action(s) designed to address the harm and/or to prevent future harm. Such actions may include, but are not limited to, monetary restitution, repayment of misappropriated resources,

compliance with a commitment not to repeat the misconduct, or other act to make whole injury caused by the faculty member's professional misconduct or to prevent future misconduct.

If the imposition of a disciplinary sanction is waived, the subsequent failure to perform the required act or otherwise comply with the conditions of the waiver will immediately subject the faculty member to the implementation of the underlying sanction without an additional hearing. The authority to determine whether the faculty member has complied with the conditions of the waiver rests with the Chancellor. The Chancellor may designate a fixed time period for compliance with the terms of the waiver, after which the authority to impose discipline will lapse. If a faculty member disputes the Chancellor's determination, the faculty member may grieve under applicable faculty grievance procedures.

A Chancellor is authorized to initiate involuntary leave with pay prior to, or at any time following, the initiation of a disciplinary action if it is found that there is a strong risk that the accused faculty member's continued assignment to regular duties or presence on campus will cause immediate and serious harm to the University community or impede the investigation of wrongdoing, or in situations where the faculty member's conduct represents a serious crime or felony that is the subject of investigation by a law enforcement agency. When such action is necessary, it must be possible to impose the involuntary leave swiftly, without resorting to normal disciplinary procedures. In rare and egregious cases, a Chancellor may be authorized by special action of The Regents to suspend the pay of a faculty member on involuntary leave pending a disciplinary action. This is in addition to the Chancellor's power to suspend the pay of a faculty member who is absent without authorization and fails to perform duties for an extended period of time, pending the resolution of the faculty member's employment status with the University.

Thereafter, the faculty member may grieve the decision to place the faculty member on involuntary leave pursuant to applicable faculty grievance procedures. The Divisional Hearing Committee ~~on Privilege and Tenure~~ shall handle such grievances on an expedited basis if so requested by the faculty member; the Committee may recommend reinstatement of pay and back pay in cases where pay status was suspended. Within 5 (five) working days after the imposition of involuntary leave, the Chancellor must explain to the faculty member in writing the reasons for the involuntary leave including the allegations being investigated and the anticipated date when charges will be brought, if substantiated.

Every such document must include the following statements: (1) the Chancellor has the discretion to end the leave at any time if circumstances merit; (2) the involuntary leave will end either when the allegations are resolved by investigation or when disciplinary proceedings are concluded and a decision has been made whether to impose disciplinary sanctions; and (3) the faculty member has the right to contest the involuntary leave in a grievance proceeding that will be handled on an expedited basis, if so requested by the faculty member.

### Section III -- Procedures for Imposition of Disciplinary Sanction

Safeguards against arbitrary or unjust disciplinary actions, including provision for hearings and appeals, are well established in the University.

The Regents' Bylaws provide that actions of certain types, some of them disciplinary in character, may not be carried out without the opportunity of a prior hearing before, or without advance consultation with, "a properly constituted advisory committee of the Academic Senate" ([Regents' Bylaws 30, 31, and 40.3.](#)).

The Academic Senate has established Committees on Privilege and Tenure in each of the ~~nine-ten~~ Divisions, as well as a systemwide University Committee on Privilege and Tenure (UCPT). The composition and duties of these Divisional committees and UCPT are defined by the Academic Senate. One of the traditional roles of the Divisional Committees on Privilege and Tenure is to conduct hearings on disciplinary charges initiated by the Chancellor under this policy and make findings of fact and recommendations to the Chancellor regarding proposed disciplinary sanctions. The procedures for disciplinary hearings, including the procedures for the Special Committee and a Systemwide Reserve Privilege and Tenure Pool, are set forth in [Academic Senate Bylaw 336](#).

Another traditional role, to be distinguished from the conduct of disciplinary hearings, is to consider grievances by members of the Academic Senate regarding their rights and privileges as faculty members. The procedures for considering grievances are set forth in [Academic Senate Bylaw 335](#). A disciplinary action is distinguished from a grievance action in that a disciplinary action generally is commenced by the administration against a faculty member based on charges that the faculty member has violated the Faculty Code of Conduct. A grievance action is initiated by a faculty member who believes that he or she has suffered injury as the result of a violation of the faculty member's rights or privileges. A grievance action specifically requests the administration to take appropriate action to eliminate or mitigate the faculty member's injury. A grievance alleging misconduct by another member of the Academic Senate may result in disciplinary proceedings commenced against that faculty member.

The Faculty Code of Conduct applies to all faculty members, Senate and non-Senate. For members of the Academic Senate, the procedures for disciplinary actions are governed by Senate Bylaws and Divisional rules. For academic appointees who are not members of the Academic Senate (and this group includes certain categories of faculty members) there are procedures for disciplinary actions separate from that of the Senate's committees. Those procedures are found in [APM - 150](#) and relevant collective bargaining agreements or Memoranda of Understanding.

The Faculty Code of Conduct also applies to faculty members holding administrative appointments. Faculty members serving as administrators may be subjected to disciplinary action under this Code

for professional misconduct in their administrative role that violates the ethical principles and falls within the types of unacceptable conduct set forth in this Code. A disciplinary action against a faculty member holding an administrative title may proceed in two parts. One part involves the removal of an administrative title or other administrative action under procedures established by The Regents and the administration. Such action need not adhere to the disciplinary procedures set forth in this policy. The other part involves the proposed imposition of any type of disciplinary sanction set forth in this policy, which must proceed in accordance with the procedures for discipline outlined in the Faculty Code of Conduct and the applicable Senate Bylaws and Divisional rules. The removal of the administrative title or other administrative action does not preclude or require the imposition of a disciplinary sanction under this policy. Administrative incompetence does not in itself constitute a violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct.

It is the responsibility of each Chancellor to establish procedures for the administration of discipline on the campus, in consultation with the campus Division of the Academic Senate and such other advisory groups as are appropriate. No disciplinary sanction for professional misconduct shall be imposed except in accordance with specified procedures. With the exception of systemwide deadlines in the disciplinary process, it is not essential that the procedures be identical on every campus. It is important, however, that the same basic principles and standards prevail throughout the University. Upon receipt of a report of an alleged Faculty Code of Conduct violation, an initial assessment should be made in accordance with the applicable policies, which includes making an immediate assessment concerning the health and safety of the complainant and the campus community. Unless extended for good cause, the following deadlines should be adhered to: the initial assessment, including a limited inquiry when appropriate to determine how to proceed, should be completed within 30 business days following receipt of the report; the investigation and the investigation report should be completed within 120 business days following the notice of investigation to the parties; and disciplinary charges should be filed within 40 business days of receipt of the investigation outcome. The timeframes above should apply unless the timeframes associated with specific policies or campus procedures require a different timeframe (e.g., the University policy on sexual violence and sexual harassment requires that an investigation be concluded within 60 to 90 business days).

Depending on whether the Academic Senate or a University office is responsible for adhering to the specified timeframe above, the Academic Senate or the designated University office may extend the above timeframes for good cause, as defined in the applicable policies and bylaws.

Requirements and recommendations for developing campus disciplinary procedures pursuant to this policy are set forth in the Faculty Code of Conduct and the Senate Bylaws. Chancellors are to keep the President informed about campus procedures and to report any significant changes made in such procedures. The President will consult periodically with the Chancellors and the Academic Senate about procedures that are being employed in order to assure equitable standards for discipline throughout the University.

### **Revision History**

#### Month DD, 2026:

- Substantive revisions to incorporate the recommendation to establish a Systemwide Reserve Privilege and Tenure Pool, coordinated by the University Committee on Privilege and Tenure.
- Substantive revisions to incorporate timeframes for completion of initial assessments, investigations and investigation reports, and the filing of disciplinary charges, as well as extensions for good cause.
- Technical revisions to reflect conforming language with Academic Senate Bylaw 336.
- Technical revision to update the number of Academic Senate divisions from nine to ten that have established a Committee on Privilege and Tenure.

#### April 20, 2022:

- Technical revisions to update references to Regental governing documents.

#### September 23, 2020:

- Technical revision to remove gendered language.

For details on prior revisions, please visit the [policy issuance web page Academic Personnel and Programs website](#).