

# THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

January 21, 2026

The Regents of the University of California met on the above date at the UCLA Luskin Conference Center, Los Angeles campus.

Members present: Regents Anguiano, Brooks, Cohen, Hernandez, Komoto, Kounalakis, Leib, Makarechian, Milliken, Myers, Reilly, Robinson, Sarris, Sures, and Wang

In attendance: Regents-designate Craven, Melton, and Tokita, Faculty Representatives Palazoglu and Scott, Staff Advisors Frías and Hanson, Secretary and Chief of Staff Lyall, General Counsel Robinson, Chief Compliance and Audit Officer Bustamante, Provost Newman, Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer Brostrom, Executive Vice President Rubin, Senior Vice President Turner, Vice Presidents Brown and Kao, Chancellors Assanis, Frenk, Gillman, Hawgood, Hu, Larive, May, and Muñoz, and Recording Secretary Li

The meeting convened at 8:40 a.m. with Chair Reilly presiding.

## 1. PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Reilly explained that the public comment period permitted members of the public an opportunity to address University-related matters. The following persons addressed the Board concerning the items noted.

- A. Jim Shroyer, parent of UC Davis student, stated that the UCD women's equestrian team was conference champion in 2023 and 2024, named 2024 women's team of the year, produced five All-Americans, and was ranked seventh in the nation. He asked why the team was being eliminated; why its expenses were five times greater than those of other teams in the nation; why the equestrian team was the only team that had to pay for a facility owned by the campus; and why the UCD Department of Animal Science, the School of Veterinary Medicine, the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, and coaches were not consulted. Mr. Shroyer stated that Director of Athletics Rocko DeLuca and an external consultant made the decision to eliminate the team with zero transparency. He asked that UC Davis and Chancellor May stay in dialogue regarding this issue.
- B. Dianna Sahhar, UC Irvine library assistant and member of the Teamsters Local 2010 Clerical and Allied Services Workers (CX) unit bargaining team, called for more salary steps to create pay equity in the unit and for the compensation of top-level performers. Union members without a higher step received a lump sum that was not base-building and not retirement-eligible. UC offered to remove lower steps in order to pay workers \$25 per hour without adding higher steps, which would compress the salary range, reduce earning potential, and lower morale.

Ms. Sahhar stressed the importance of more steps for those closer to retirement, noting that retirement benefits were determined by the highest three years of pay.

- C. Daniel Sepulveda, UCLA graduate student and Student Advocate to the Regents (StAR), asked that UC provide greater certainty, coordination, and support for graduate students, especially international students. Visa restrictions limited employment and travel, so late payments, last-minute contract changes, and unclear timelines created financial and legal risks. Systemwide protocols were needed to ensure timely payment, predictable appointment timelines, and clear communication before funding begins. Mr. Sepulveda also urged the Regents to consider alternative resources after millions of dollars in funding for the Center for Developing Leadership in Science (CDLS) at UCLA were terminated or suspended.
- D. Stephanie Ha, UCLA student and representative of Survivors + Allies at UCLA, demanded that UC define and prohibit technology-facilitated sexual violence, including sexual abuse generated by artificial intelligence (AI), within current Title IX policy. A 2025 systemwide Survivors + Allies study found that one in ten survivors experienced online sexual harm and that respondents did not think that UC would believe them. In light of recent news that thousands of nonconsensual sexual images were generated using AI tools, Ms. Ha called attention to the rapid expansion of harmful AI use, lack of legal enforcement, and absence of clear policy protections. She stated that the UC system should recognize these harms as serious and deserving of an institutional response and be a national leader in this effort. Ms. Ha stated that survivor care is health care.
- E. Anna Allen, resident in a manufactured home owned by Yes! Communities in Springfield, Illinois, called attention to poor property management, annual lease signing, and annual lot rent increases.
- F. Kadidia Thiero, staff member at CDLS, called on the Regents to draw emergency funding from the Blue and Gold Endowment Pool to make up for funding that CDLS lost due to the shutdown of federal programs. CDLS was one of the nation's most innovative and transformative training programs in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM). Funding CDLS would enable over 150 students, fellows, and postdoctoral researchers to continue their studies, research, and journeys in STEM fields.
- G. Jordan Ash, representative of the Private Equity Stakeholder Project, urged UC not to make any future investments with private equity firm Brookfield until the company agrees to meet with Yes! Communities residents and commit to a basic set of standards. Brookfield was in the process of acquiring Yes! Communities, which owned 266 manufactured homes parks, an important source of affordable housing, especially for seniors and individuals with disabilities. Mr. Ash noted a pattern of private equity firms buying a park, increasing rent to boost cash flow, and then selling the park for a profit. Across the country, residents reported rents

increasing up to 100 percent after private equity landlords took over their parks, as well as serious maintenance problems. There were already many issues with the current owner of Yes! Communities, but residents would not be able to withstand conditions under a new private equity owner.

- H. Michael Avant, President of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) 3299, stated that union members have been without a contract for more than one year and were earning less than they had one decade ago. Mr. Avant disputed the claims that UC did not have enough funding, stating that UC's financial reports indicated that revenues, investments, State appropriations, and unrestricted cash reserves have doubled, UC medical center revenues have tripled, and executive pay has doubled. He added that UC paid tens of millions of dollars in bonus pay, bought eight hospitals, and took in \$5.5 billion more than it spent while frontline workers faced housing insecurity and students experienced food insecurity. AFSCME 3299 would not stop fighting until changes are made.
- I. Jose Guzman, UC food service worker and member of AFSCME 329, stated that workers were an essential part of the prestige and the excellence that distinguished the University and that salaries and wages should align with reality. Workers deserved a dignified life, without constant preoccupation with whether wages would satisfy basic needs, but current wages were insufficient given the high cost of living. Mr. Guzman lost his telephone service because he could not make payments; this was a reality that he and many of his colleagues faced. UC must recognize workers as human beings, empathize with them, and meet their demands.
- J. Nan Renner, UC San Diego staff member, stated that the Trump administration has weaponized the federal government, terrorized communities, and broken the law. She stated that elected State leaders, Regents, chancellors, and UC community members had a responsibility to call attention to tyranny and to demand that the federal government abide by the U.S. Constitution. Ms. Renner wished to hear a clear message from UC leadership that the University would not cooperate with a lawless regime. She stated that silence is complicity.
- K. Ricardo Miranda, UC San Diego student and StAR, called for a revolution of opportunity. Opportunity and affordability were foundational to the UC system, but such a foundation was cracking under inflationary costs and evolving tuition structures. True opportunity was created through a state-of-the-art education, but students struggled to pay rent and tuition and were forced to absorb financial shortfalls, and undocumented and international students bore a disproportionate share of that burden. Mr. Miranda called on the University to fund essential needs for students and urged the Regents to pay close attention to the remarks of UC Student Association President Aditi Hariharan's remarks later in the meeting.
- L. Tai-Ge Min, UCLA student and StAR, spoke on behalf of the UC Divest Coalition to urge the University to divest from Blackstone, in which it invested \$8.6 billion.

Blackstone owned over 300,000 properties across the U.S. and spent millions lobbying against housing policies, and Blackstone Chief Executive Officer Stephen Schwarzman was an advisor to U.S. President Trump during his first term. The average Blackstone property was located where people of color made up 58 percent of the population. In Los Angeles and Riverside, 67 percent of Blackstone residents reported being rent burdened and 17 percent reported being extremely rent burdened. Blackstone also acquired American Campus Communities, which owned student apartments at the Berkeley, Irvine, and Riverside campuses. In 2023, UC invested \$4.5 billion in the Blackstone Real Estate Income Trust (BREIT), and in Los Angeles alone over hundreds of evictions from Blackstone properties followed. In order for the University to reach a target return on investment of 11.75 percent by 2028, Blackstone would have to raise rent by 12 percent every year. The UC Divest Coalition sought to have a dialogue with the University in order to find solutions amidst funding and other challenges.

- M. Namrata Deepak, UCLA student and StAR, called for the funding and implementation of programs like the UCLA Compassionate Response (CORE) team at every campus. CORE professionals were first responders for mental health crises and offered care before situations escalated to crises. In addition to the stress of navigating college, the COVID-19 pandemic, campus instability, Los Angeles wildfires, and federal funding cuts have had a detrimental impact on student mental health. According to recent data, student academic performance declined by a full letter grade as a result of federal funding cuts.
- N. William Kidder, co-chair of the UC Riverside Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) Advisory Committee, expressed gratitude to Regent Sarris, the first chair of a federally recognized Indian tribe to serve on the Board, for his leadership on NAGPRA issues. There was much more work to do on repatriation and other tribal issues, and having tribal partners and perspectives on the Board was important to the success of the University.
- O. Maya Bristow-Ingkom, UCLA student, called for divestment from Blackstone, Blackrock, and all other corporations upholding apartheid and genocide. She stated that the recent tuition increase would reduce access to education and that tuition dollars were being funneled into colonization and murder instead of helping the UCLA community. Ms. Bristow-Ingkom expressed hope that UCLA would demonstrate advocating for what is right.
- P. Shir Diner, UC Irvine student and Vice President of the Hillel International Israel Leadership Network, thanked the Regents for their commitment to the Hillel Campus Climate Initiative, which educated university administrators on antisemitism. She stated that, despite this, antisemitic and anti-Israel rhetoric was being normalized under the guise of free speech. Jewish students reported feeling targeted in the classroom, and the Associated Students of UC Irvine decided that a proposed resolution to recognize International Holocaust Remembrance Day was

too political. Ms. Diner called on UC to follow the example of the California State University and to create an antisemitism task force comprised of Jewish students.

- Q. Margaret Simon, UCLA alumna, addressed item B3, *Dismissal of Faculty Member, Los Angeles Campus*, and asked the Board to explicitly state the faculty member's violation and to terminate the faculty member immediately. Terminating a faculty member for violating the Faculty Code of Conduct and without publicly stating a legitimate transgression would be directly opposed to its intent, to protect academic freedom. Ms. Simon asked how UC justified spending hundreds of thousands of taxpayer dollars on a termination for a transgression that UC could not or would not state.
- R. Jack Feng, UCLA graduate student and UCLA Graduate Students Association External Vice President, stated that University-allowed speech and political demonstrations on campus have increasingly exposed students to harm. At UCLA, an anti-LGBTQ gathering was held near the LGBTQ Campus Resource Center, and an anti-immigration demonstration took place near a Latino(a) student welcome event. At UC Berkeley, an event hosted by conservative advocacy group Turning Point USA led to student protest and police violence, resulting in the closure of campus buildings providing essential student services. Mr. Feng stated that these events repeatedly and disproportionately targeted certain communities. Time, place, and manner policies alone were not enough; UC must evaluate deescalation protocols, event location decisions, and law enforcement response, especially when certain activities are designed to provoke, intimidate, and incite harm.
- S. Jamie Lucarelli, UCLA staff member, called for emergency funding for CDLS from the Blue and Gold Endowment Pool or other sources, noting that hundreds of students benefited from mentorship at CDLS. Ms. Lucarelli recalled her experience as a transfer student at UCLA, her graduate education, and working at the National Laboratories before returning to work as a project scientist at UCLA, where she has been supported by CDLS Director Aradhna Tripathi.
- T. Jennifer Miyaki, UCLA alumna with disabilities, implored the Regents, Chancellor Frenk, UCLA Associate Vice Chancellor of Student Development and Health Suzanne Seplow, and UCLA Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS) Director Nicole Presley to provide students with medical leave, more therapy sessions, more funding for UCLA Compassionate Response, and to engage in a discussion about suicide on campus, noting that least five UCLA students died last quarter by suicide or overdose. UCLA offered only eight to 11 therapy sessions to students with UC Student Health Insurance Program (SHIP) coverage and four to six sessions to students without coverage, and policies prevented students from taking mental health leave. Ms. Miyaki recalled being disconnected from the CAPS hotline when she was in crisis.
- U. Jose Alvarenga, UCLA student, immigrant from Honduras, and organizer for the Coalition to Defend Affirmative Action, Integration and Immigrant Rights, and

Fight for Equality By Any Means Necessary (BAMN), stated that the Trump administration was terrorizing Latino(a), Black, and immigrant communities and repressing the movement for democracy, citing the killing of Renee Good and the capture of Nicolás Maduro as examples. Mr. Alvarenga took exception to the University's cowardly attitude toward the Trump administration, tuition increases, the repression of the rights of those who speak out against the genocide in Gaza, and disregard for the plight of immigrant students and their families.

- V. Leigh Dundas, parent of a UC Davis student, stated that UCD Director of Athletics Rocko DeLuca threatened, intimidated, and coerced the UCD women's equestrian team. Disputing his assertion that eliminating the women's equestrian team would not have Title IX consequences, she stated that the spirit of Title IX was to put girls' sports on equal footing with boys' sports. The football stadium was being refurbished for \$50 million while the women's equestrian team had to change their clothing in a horse barn and paid \$14,000 per month, in addition to \$200,000 for concrete. Ms. Dundas stated that parents of the team included attorneys and one judge.
- W. Maliha Sharma, UCLA student and representative of the UCLA Undergraduate Students Association Council, asked the Regents to adopt as a systemwide policy the inclusion of gamma-hydroxybutyrate (GHB) and ketamine in standard toxicology screenings. Ms. Sharma stated that, at Ronald Reagan UCLA Medical Center, standard toxicology screenings did not test for ketamine or GHB, commonly used substances for intoxication in sexual assault cases. As a result, students who believed that they were drugged were not receiving timely testing, leading to lost evidence and barriers to filing a police report.
- X. Everardo Serrano, UCLA staff member and member of AFSCME Local 3299, stated that UC had multiple profit streams that placed the University in the strongest financial position in its history. Mr. Serrano disputed the idea that UC could not afford to provide workers with health care and pay them wages that covered their expenses. This was the first time in 14 years at UC Mr. Serrano has ever struggled financially; he was stretching his paychecks and has taken a second job. He called on UC to give workers a contract that they deserved.
- Y. Holden Hughes, former Division I football player and co-founder of the NIL Insurance Company, noted that income generated from name, image, and likeness (NIL) was not covered by insurance when a student-athlete suffers season- or career-ending injury. A UCLA study found a rise in injuries sustained by younger athletes, and a National Institutes of Health study found that collegiate athletes averaged more than two injuries per year. Mr. Hughes stated that this created the potential for financial harm to athletes and financial, compliance, and reputational risks for institutions. He asked if Regents evaluated NIL-related income loss due to injury or illness as part of UC's broader risk and athlete-welfare framework.

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meetings of November 14, 2024 and January 23, March 20, May 15, September 17, and November 20, 2025 were approved, Regents Anguiano, Brooks, Cohen, Hernandez, Komoto, Kounalakis, Makarechian, Milliken, Myers, Reilly, and Sarris voting “aye.”<sup>1</sup>

**3. REMARKS FROM STUDENT ASSOCIATIONS**

President Milliken introduced UC Student Association (UCSA) President Aditi Hariharan.

Ms. Hariharan stated that, as the second largest employer in California, the world’s fourth largest economy, the University had a fiscal impact of \$82 billion, and that one in every 45 jobs in the state was supported by the University’s activities. She noted power wielded by UC as it created substantial pathways to social mobility, furthered global education and employment, and influenced a wide range of academic thought. The Regents had oversight over the entire University system and could exercise accountability by analyzing the large amount of data it generated, such as through the UC Accountability Report. Ms. Hariharan expressed appreciation for Regents Hernandez’s and Anguiano’s earlier comments about underrepresented student data, and she shared additional student perspectives.

While UC has improved its measurement of equity gaps in the last decade, those gaps have not closed. From 2018 to 2024, the six-year graduation rate rose by about one percent among underrepresented groups, first-generation students, and Pell Grant recipients. In the same period, first-year retention rose a fraction of a percent among underrepresented students and dropped about one percent among first-generation students and Pell Grant recipients. Four-year graduation rates were lower among these groups compared with those of other students. UC has made progress in addressing the needs of certain communities but not others. The gap in campus climate issues, such as feelings of belonging and respect or matters of discrimination and marginalization, between Black students and students from other groups has remained wide. Since setting the goal of enrolling one transfer student for every two freshman students in 2015, UC has met the goal twice, in 2019–20 and 2020–21. Transfer students were more commonly first-generation students, re-entry, and caregiving students. However, despite diverse community college student populations, underrepresented minority students made up a larger share of freshman enrollment than transfer enrollment. Ms. Hariharan asked the Regents to direct the Office of the President to present UC accountability data with a focus on how to close these gaps through targeted support. She underscored the importance of experiential data and student input to demonstrate how this support affects the student experience, and she expressed gratitude for the Regents’ continued engagement with students.

Ms. Hariharan addressed the Faculty Code of Conduct and the faculty discipline process, expressing concern that two types of misconduct subject to discipline, “disturbing the peace” and “not following instructions from officials,” seemed more like typical protest

---

<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.

activity rather than misconduct. Punishments were determined by evaluating the impact of the misconduct on community members and their families, but the lack of a clear definition of “impact” could lead to faculty harm. The emotional impact of political speech could be used to justify harsher punishment, even if the faculty speech itself was protected. Defending one’s own speech when charged with misconduct, rather than apologizing, could be regarded as “not accepting responsibility for misconduct,” an aggravating factor. This could serve to limit academic and personal speech. In Ms. Hariharan’s view, the term “expressive activity” was very ambiguous, and its interpretation could differ based on how the activity was regarded by University administration. Differentiating academic freedom from free speech using “scholarly rigor,” coupled with administrative overreach, could lead to UC narrowing protections for faculty and removing faculty’s ability to develop their own curricula. Ms. Hariharan expressed deep concern about restrictions on faculty’s extramural speech. Faculty speech via social media, in interviews, or at rallies could be subject to discipline if deemed to conflict with the University’s interests or mission. In her view, employees’ rights, wellness, and wages were low on the list of the University’s manifold interests, which included reputation, donor relations, and the avoidance of public controversy and political backlash. These restrictions could be used to chill faculty expression and would set a terrifying precedent for free speech, political discourse, and work-life separation, reducing every UC employee to solely their labor and UC affiliation.

Ms. Hariharan concluded by calling attention to massive unrest related to campus climate and safety, especially due to significant threats from U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement; student free speech; struggles with affordability and basic needs; long-term impacts of the federal government’s actions; the need for fair wages and health care, and much more. Given the Board’s power to make a difference, she looked forward to working with the Regents to ensure student consultation.

Chair Reilly introduced UC Graduate and Professional Council (UCGPC) President Stephanie Valadez.

Ms. Valadez began her remarks by acknowledging that the meeting was being held on land stewarded by the Gabrielino-Tongva tribe. She recalled the length of her first remarks to the Board and explained that she used that time to speak to both the Regents and the over 63,000 students whom she represented. She had shared her experience with police activity at UC Santa Cruz in 2024 which had endangered her children. Since then, students across the ten campuses have expressed their fear and extreme mistrust of the University regarding policing, data sharing, and privacy. Six months later, student families were still exposed to the unhealthy living conditions that Ms. Valadez had raised in her initial remarks. She expressed fear that her term as UCGPC president would end before changes are made to alleviate students’ rent burden. In those remarks, Ms. Valadez had warned of the loss of diversity in academia, and now students of color were fearful that UC would not warn them about the presence of ICE in time. She had asked the Regents to remember their mission, vision, and values, and to form a reciprocal relationship in order to forge a path toward holistic student support. Since then, UCGPC has maintained consistent communication with President Milliken, Regental leadership, governmental relations, basic needs staff, budget staff, and Academic Affairs staff. This created a potential path toward rebuilding

trust with students. Also in the last six months, UCGPC brought two Student Advocates to the Regents to every Regents meeting, launched Student Advocates program in partnership with the UC Advocacy Network and the Office of Federal Governmental Relations to advocate for federal funding, and has continued to engage in State and federal advocacy through letter writing campaigns, public comment, and participating in panels. UCGPC planned to meet with State legislators in March and go to Washington, D.C. in April. Ms. Valadez hoped that, in the second half of her term, it would become clear that students and the administration have shared goals, values, and experiences.

Ms. Valadez's role as UCGPC President humbled her, and she asked herself whether she was right for the role for the last six months and would be right for the role in the next six months. She recalled President Milliken's reaction to the small gift she gave him when she first met him in August 2025. Observing his interaction with students during lunch that day made Ms. Valadez realize that she was meant to serve as a conduit. Over the last six months, her requests have not changed. She called for a return to the University's values and connections. When students, faculty, and staff are regarded as people instead of numbers, statistics, and angry comments, the University could make true change and return to its former beauty.

The Board recessed at 9:40 a.m.

.....  
The Board reconvened at 9:50 a.m. with Chair Reilly presiding.

Members present: Regents Anguiano, Batchlor, Brooks, Cohen, Hernandez, Komoto, Kounalakis, Leib, Makarechian, Milliken, Myers, Park, Reilly, Robinson, Sarris, Sures, and Wang

In attendance: Regents-designate Craven, Melton, and Tokita, Faculty Representatives Palazoglu and Scott, Staff Advisors Frías and Hanson, Secretary and Chief of Staff Lyall, General Counsel Robinson, Chief Compliance and Audit Officer Bustamante, Provost Newman, Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer Brostrom, Executive Vice President Rubin, Senior Vice President Turner, Vice Presidents Brown and Kao, Chancellors Assanis, Frenk, Gillman, Hawgood, Hu, Larive, May, and Muñoz, and Recording Secretary Li

#### 4. **DISMISSAL OF FACULTY MEMBER, LOS ANGELES CAMPUS**

[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.]

Deputy General Counsel Allison Woodall described the process for this item. Professor Priyanga Amarasekare was given the opportunity to appear at the meeting and provide a written statement to the Board, but she declined to do so. She requested that this matter be held in open session, which she was permitted to do under the open meeting laws. After the presentation and discussion, the Board would convene in closed session to deliberate

on the recommendation. The dismissal of an academic appointee who holds tenure or security of employment can only be approved by the Board of Regents. Before a dismissal action comes to the Board, it undergoes a rigorous process at the campus, during which it is reviewed by a group of faculty peers and then reviewed by the chancellor, followed by review by the President, who makes a recommendation to the Board. All of those steps have occurred in this matter, and the item was properly before the Board on this day. Under Regents Bylaw 40.3, the Regents were tasked with determining if there is good cause for termination.

Provost Newman stated that the Academic Personnel Manual Section 015 (APM - 015) established expectations for faculty conduct and identified the types of unacceptable conduct with regard to teaching and students, scholarship, the University, colleagues, and the community. Conduct departing from these standards was viewed by faculty as unacceptable because it was inconsistent with the mission of the University. APM - 016, The University Policy on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline, outlined the process for disciplinary action and the types of discipline available. This case involved a UCLA faculty member who has repeatedly violated the Faculty Code of Conduct. Under the Academic Senate Bylaws, when an allegation of the Senate faculty member's misconduct becomes known by a responsible party, a multiple-step process follows. In this case, a formal investigation was led by the Committee on Charges from the UCLA Division of the Academic Senate. If the Committee on Charges issues a probable cause determination and the process leads to the filing of disciplinary charges with the Committee on Privilege and Tenure, a meeting before the appointed hearing committee is held following the procedures outlined in Academic Senate Bylaw 336. The hearing committee's report informs the chancellor's decision on the type of discipline to impose in accordance with APM - 016. An accused faculty member has multiple opportunities during and following this process to rebut testimony, explain evidence, grieve over improper process, and the like. The chancellor or their designee and the accused may attempt to resolve the matter through negotiation at any stage of this process.

Vice Provost Monica Varsanyi summarized the basis for the dismissal recommendation. Ms. Amarasekare was appointed by UCLA as a tenured associate professor in 2005 in the Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology. The recommendation for dismissal followed an earlier disciplinary action in 2022, in which she was suspended without pay for one year, received a 20 percent salary reduction for two years, and received a letter of censure. At the time, a privilege and tenure (P&T) hearing committee found clear and convincing evidence that she violated ethical standards and rules about the confidentiality of colleagues and their academic reviews, personnel actions, and disciplinary procedures, as well as making unfounded accusations about colleagues' professional competence not reflective of their professional performance. In this current case, a different P&T hearing committee comprised of her faculty peers unanimously found clear and convincing evidence that Ms. Amarasekare had violated multiple provisions of the Faculty Code of Conduct. The committee's findings included harassment and discrimination against others, breaches of established rules regarding confidentiality in personnel procedures, intentional disruption of University functions, and violations of standards regarding the professional conduct of faculty. Regarding the harassment and discrimination, the hearing committee

found clear and convincing evidence that Ms. Amarasekare harassed and discriminated against a colleague based on ethnicity in violation of the Anti-Discrimination Policy and the Faculty Code of Conduct. Ms. Amarasekare repeatedly accused the faculty member of unsubstantiated wrongdoing, made false statements about them, interfered with their scholarship, and created an environment of race-based accusations that “had a substantial impact so severe, pervasive, and persistent that it caused the individual’s working environment to be hostile, intimidating, abusive, and offensive.” The hearing committee also found clear and convincing evidence that Ms. Amarasekare harassed multiple other colleagues to such an extent that it significantly interfered with the performance of their University duties and activities. For example, using the departmental email list, also known as a listserv, which included students and postdoctoral researchers, she sent numerous emails and communications accusing specific individuals of a multitude of unsubstantiated allegations, including fraud, slander, lying, and racism, in which she misrepresented facts or omitted information to fit her narrative. The hearing committee found that her accusations “increasingly seemed to be based less on good faith assessment than on vindictive and retaliatory motives. Professor Amarasekare made general assertions such as that all white faculty were racist or upholding a racist agenda and used that to challenge their departmental service roles. The conduct interfered with departmental operations to such an extent that multiple people stepped down from leadership roles early or declined to take on leadership roles. It also interfered with day-to-day functions of the department, as people did not wish to attend or participate in departmental meetings.

Regarding the intentional disruption of University functions, the hearing committee found clear and convincing evidence that Ms. Amarasekare intentionally disrupted a personnel meeting in which a fellow faculty member was being reviewed. She criticized a faculty member’s teaching based on information not in the faculty member’s review file, which violated the APM, and also criticized failures in the department’s review process. When told her statements were not allowed under policy, she responded that she could say anything she wanted without restrictions because she was a woman of color and a member of a protected class. Although this finding was based on a single personnel meeting, the hearing committee found it to be a serious violation because she had received prior corrections and warnings, including from the P&T hearing committee in her earlier disciplinary case, in which she was told not to raise conduct accusations or information outside of a person’s dossier during personnel discussions. Regarding the breach of established confidentiality rules, the hearing committee found clear and convincing evidence that Ms. Amarasekare purposefully rejected confidentiality policies and Academic Senate Bylaws regarding the confidentiality of disciplinary matters, which significantly impaired the University’s functions. For example, in her prior disciplinary case, the P&T hearing committee had declined her request to publicly release its report. The committee was concerned that significant redactions would be required to protect the confidentiality of witnesses, and a highly redacted report would not provide an accurate picture of the proceedings. She released the materials anyway. The hearing committee found that she “demonstrated a pattern of releasing incomplete information, which results in a misleading and inaccurate account of the relevant offense and the disciplinary process appearing in public spaces” and that she “enhanced the seriousness of her violations by her pattern of rejecting University policies, guidance, and outcomes and deliberately choosing

to release information that is misleading.” In summarizing its findings and conclusions, the hearing committee observed that Ms. Amarasekare “shows no willingness to be part of shared governance,” that she rejects policies and procedures to such an extent that “she cannot function in the department,” and that she gives “no indication that she accepts that any of her conduct merits correction.” As a result, the hearing committee recommended dismissal from University employment, which could be waived if she met certain conditions, including a commitment not to violate further any University policies or Academic Senate Bylaws and not to harass or discriminate against her colleagues in a way that would interfere with their University activities. Assuming dismissal was held in abeyance, the hearing committee also recommended her permanent suspension from departmental membership and participation in departmental governance, with her appointment being transferred to a divisional appointment. On September 4, 2025, Chancellor Frenk accepted all of the hearing committee’s findings as well as its recommendation for dismissal. He did not agree that the dismissal should be waived contingent on her compliance with conditions to which she had shown no willingness or ability to adhere. Chancellor Frenk issued his decision to recommend dismissal of Ms. Amarasekare from the University to President Milliken. Independent of the decision by the Regents on the recommendation for dismissal, Chancellor Frenk imposed the disciplinary sanction of suspension without pay for three years.

Chancellor Frenk summarized the amount of harm that Ms. Amarasekare’s misconduct has inflicted on members of the UCLA community and why he was recommending dismissal from University employment. Ms. Amarasekare’s years of misconduct have harmed her department and her colleagues. Because of her, faculty have left, others have refused to serve in leadership positions, some have stopped attending faculty meetings, and governance of the department has seriously suffered. Faculty in the department have been silenced, afraid to exercise academic freedom and participate in discussions about personnel files or other matters that are essential to a functioning academic department. As a result of her public accusations and harassment, several faculty members have stepped down from or declined leadership positions in the department. The department and campus have suffered reputational harm as a result of Ms. Amarasekare’s campaign of public accusations and misinformation. The 2021 and 2024 P&T hearings established that she had a pattern of violating University policy despite efforts to bring her conduct into compliance by means of lesser sanctions and numerous counseling attempts. Nothing the University has done to date has succeeded in curbing her misconduct. Based on this history, Chancellor Frenk saw no reason to believe that providing further opportunities for Ms. Amarasekare to change her conduct would deter her from the same pattern of conduct. To allow her to resume her position would undoubtedly subject her colleagues and students to the highly toxic work and learning environment about which they expressed concern during her presence on campus. It would also broadcast the signal that this type of conduct is acceptable to the University of California and would deter others from reporting concerns in the future. Chancellor Frenk stated that he considered all of the relevant policies and carefully reviewed the materials associated with this case, and he acknowledged the levels of due process and measures of support afforded to the faculty member. As Chancellor, it was his duty to uphold the policies of the University. Ms. Amarasekare’s arguments and concerns have been reviewed and considered, and UC policies were followed. Chancellor

Frenk believed dismissal to be the appropriate action for Ms. Amarasekare, given the University's duty as an employer to separate an employee who seriously violates University policies in a way that harms others.

Regent Hernandez, referring to the written materials, noted that Ms. Amarasekare had filed a discrimination complaint and asked whether it was resolved. Regent Hernandez wished to ensure that she was provided with due process. Michael Levine, Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and Personnel at UCLA, replied in the affirmative. There had been one charge that a faculty member had misused procedures, but no finding that discrimination had occurred.

Regent Sures asked why this was an open session item and why the faculty member declined to be present, noting that neither was usual practice in his experience. Ms. Woodall replied that a faculty dismissal had been presented in open session about six years ago. Under open meeting laws, the person charged with misconduct could ask that the item be held in open session, which was what Ms. Amarasekare requested.

Regent Sures asked whether Ms. Woodall encountered a situation in which the person charged with misconduct is not present. Ms. Woodall responded that this was unusual; most of the time, the faculty member was present.

The Board recessed at 10:10 a.m.

.....  
The Board reconvened at 2:50 p.m. with Chair Reilly presiding.

Members present: Regents Anguiano, Batchlor, Brooks, Cohen, Hernandez, Komoto, Kounalakis, Leib, Makarechian, Matosantos, Milliken, Park, Reilly, Sarris, Thurmond, and Wang

In attendance: Regents-designate Craven, Melton, and Tokita, Faculty Representatives Palazoglu and Scott, Staff Advisors Frías and Hanson, Secretary and Chief of Staff Lyall, General Counsel Robinson, Provost Newman, Senior Vice President Turner, Vice Presidents Brown and Kao, Chancellors Assanis, Frenk, Hawgood, Hu, Larive, May, and Muñoz, and Recording Secretary Li

## 5. COMMITTEE REPORTS INCLUDING APPROVAL OF RECOMMENDATIONS FROM COMMITTEES

Chair Reilly stated that Chairs of Committees and Special Committees that met at this meeting and off-cycle would deliver reports on recommended actions and items discussed, providing an opportunity for Regents who did not attend a particular meeting to ask questions.

**Report of the Academic and Student Affairs Committee**

The Committee presented the following from its meeting of January 21, 2026:

**A. *Approval of Multi-Year Plans for Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition for Three Graduate Professional Degree Programs***

The Committee recommended that the Regents approve the multi-year plans for charging Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition 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>				
	<b><u>2026-27</u></b>	<b><u>2027-28</u></b>	<b><u>2028-29</u></b>	<b><u>2029-30</u></b>	<b><u>2030-31</u></b>
<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.

Upon motion of Regent Leib, duly seconded, the recommendation of item A above of the Academic and the Student Affairs Committee was approved, Regents Anguiano, Batchlor, Brooks, Cohen, Hernandez, Komoto, Leib, Makarechian, Matosantos, Milliken, Park, Reilly, Sarris, and Wang voting “aye” and Regents Kounalakis and Thurmond voting “no.”

**B. *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 Committee recommended to the Regents 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.

Upon motion of Regent Leib, duly seconded, the recommendation of item B above of the Academic and the Student Affairs Committee was approved, Regents Anguiano, Batchlor, Brooks, Cohen, Hernandez, Komoto, Kounalakis, Leib, Makarechian, Matosantos, Milliken, Park, Reilly, Sarris, Thurmond, and Wang voting “aye.”

**Report of the Finance and Capital Strategies Committee**

The Committee presented the following from its meeting of January 21, 2026:

***Review of the Governor's January Budget Proposal for 2026–27***

This item was not summarized.

**Report of the Governance Committee**

The Committee presented the following from its meeting of January 20, 2026:

***Amendment of May 2026 Regents Meeting Dates***

The Committee recommended to the Regents that the May 2026 Regents meeting be held on May 5–6, 2026.

Upon motion of Chair Reilly, duly seconded, the recommendation of the Governance Committee was approved, Regents Anguiano, Batchlor, Brooks, Cohen, Hernandez, Komoto, Kounalakis, Leib, Makarechian, Matosantos, Milliken, Park, Reilly, Sarris, and Wang voting “aye.”

**Report of the Health Services Committee**

The Committee presented the following from its meeting of January 20, 2025:

A. ***Approval of Extension of the Appointment of and Compensation for Michael Condrin as Interim Chief Executive Officer, UC Davis Health, Davis Campus as Discussed in Closed Session***

The Committee reported approval of the following items in connection with the extension of the appointment of and compensation for Michael Condrin as Interim Chief Executive Officer, UC Davis Health, Davis campus, in addition to his existing appointment as System Chief Operating Officer and Chief Administrator, UC Davis Medical Center, Davis campus:

- (1) Per policy, the appointment of Michael Condrin as Interim Chief Executive Officer, UC Davis Health, Davis campus, effective February 1, 2026 through December 31, 2026 or until the appointment of a new Chief Executive Officer, UC Davis Health, Davis campus, whichever occurs first.
- (2) Per policy, an annual base salary of \$1,096,603 during Mr. Condrin's appointment as Interim Chief Executive Officer, UC Davis Health, Davis campus, and during a transition period for up to two months following the start date of a new Chief Executive Officer, UC Davis Health, Davis campus. At the conclusion of the transition period, Mr. Condrin's annual

base salary will revert to his annual base salary in effect as of January 26, 2025 (\$833,600) plus any adjustments made under the UC Davis salary program during the current and extended interim appointments and/or transition periods.

- (3) Per policy, continued eligibility to participate in the Short Term Incentive (STI) component of the Clinical Enterprise Management Recognition Plan (CEMRP), remaining at the Chief Operating Officer position level with a target award of 15 percent of base salary (\$164,490 during the interim appointment) and a maximum potential award of 25 percent of base salary (\$274,150 during the interim appointment), subject to all applicable plan requirements and Administrative Oversight Committee approval. Mr. Condrin will not be eligible to participate in the Long Term Incentive (LTI) component of CEMRP. Any actual STI award will be determined based on performance against pre-established objectives.
- (4) Per policy, continuation of standard pension and health and welfare benefits and standard senior management benefits (including eligibility for senior management life insurance and, after five consecutive years of Senior Management Group service, eligibility for executive salary continuation for disability.)
- (5) Per policy, continued eligibility to participate in the UC Employee Housing Assistance Program, subject to all applicable program requirements.
- (6) Mr. Condrin will continue to comply with the Senior Management Group Outside Professional Activities (OPA) policy and reporting requirements.

The compensation described above shall constitute the University's total commitment until modified by the Regents or President, as applicable under Regents policy, and shall supersede all previous oral and written commitments. Compensation recommendations and final actions will be released to the public as required in accordance with the standard procedures of the Board of Regents.

B. ***Optimizing Employee Access to Care: An Update from the University of California Health Clinical Quality Committee***

This item was not summarized.

**Report of the National Laboratories Committee**

The Committee presented the following from its meeting of January 20, 2026:

***Annual Report on Fiscal Year 2025 National Laboratory Performance Ratings***

This item was not summarized.

**Report of the Public Engagement and Development Committee**

The Committee presented the following from its meeting of January 20–21, 2026:

**A. *Endorsement of Inspiring Change: The Campaign for UC Santa Cruz***

The Committee recommended that the Regents endorse *Inspiring Change: The Campaign for UC Santa Cruz*.

**B. *Green Grounds Certification and Biodiversity, UCLA***

This item was not summarized.

**C. *Update on Systemwide Alumni Association***

This item was not summarized.

Upon motion of Regent Sarris, duly seconded, the recommendation of the Public Engagement and Development Committee was approved, Regents Anguiano, Batchlor, Brooks, Cohen, Hernandez, Komoto, Kounalakis, Leib, Makarechian, Matosantos, Milliken, Park, Reilly, Sarris and Wang voting “aye.”

**Report of the Special Committee on Nominations**

The Committee presented the following from its meeting of January 20, 2026:

***Appointment of Advisory Member to the Health Services Committee***

The Special Committee recommended that Mark Laret be appointed as an Advisory Member to the Health Services Committee, effectively immediately for a term ending June 30, 2027.

Upon motion of Regent Cohen, duly seconded, the recommendation of the Special Committee on Nominations was approved, Regents Anguiano, Batchlor, Brooks, Cohen, Hernandez, Komoto, Kounalakis, Leib, Makarechian, Matosantos, Milliken, Park, Reilly, Sarris and Wang voting “aye.”

**6. REPORT OF MATERIALS MAILED BETWEEN MEETINGS**

Secretary and Chief of Staff Lyall reported that, on the dates indicated, the following were sent to the Regents or to Committees:

**To the Regents of the University of California:**

- A. From the President of the University, *Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory Director Nomination Request*. November 25, 2025.

- B. From the Associate Vice President – Federal Governmental Relations, *Federal Update, 2025, Issue 10*. December 2, 2025.
- C. From the Associate Vice President, – Federal Governmental Relations, *Federal Update 2025, Issue 8*. December 2, 2025.
- D. From the Vice President – Agriculture and Natural Resources, *Connected - Newsletter of UC ANR: Volume 9, Number 11*. December 2, 2025
- E. From the President of the University, *UC Health Fiscal Year 2024–2025 Report on Covered Affiliations*. December 3, 2025.
- F. From the President of the University, *Annual Report on Compensated Outside Professional Activities for Reporting Period July 1, 2024, through June 30, 2025: Deans and Certain Other Full-Time Faculty Administrators (“OPA Report”)*. December 3, 2025.
- G. From the President of the University, *Revised Report: UC Health Fiscal Year 2024–2025 Report on Covered Affiliations*. December 4, 2025.
- H. From the President of the University, *University of California Medical Centers Report for the Three Months Ended September 30, 2025*. December 12, 2025.
- I. From the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff to The UC Regents, *Summary of Communications (SOC) September, October and November 2025*. December 12, 2025.
- J. From the President of the University, *Annual Report on Executive Compensation for the Calendar Year 2024*. December 17, 2025.
- K. From the Associate Vice President – Federal Governmental Relations, *Federal Update, 2025, Issue 11*. December 19, 2025.
- L. From the Vice President – Agriculture and Natural Resources, *Connected – Newsletter of UC ANR: Volume 9, Number 12*. January 7, 2026.

**To the Members of the Regents Committee on Compliance and Audit Committee**

- M. From the President of the University, *UC College of the Law San Francisco Annual Audit Reports*. November 25, 2025.
- N. From the President of the University, *UC Finance Division, Office of Risk Services Biennial Report for FY 2023-2024 through FY 2024-FY 2025*. November 25, 2025.

- O. From the President of the University, *Significant Information Technology Projects reporting for the period May 1, 2025, through August 31, 2025*. December 17, 2025.

**To the Members of the Academic and Student Affairs Committee**

- P. From the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff to The Regents, *Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST)*. January 8, 2026.

The meeting adjourned at 3:00 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](#).