

**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

DRAFT
APM - 016

University Policy on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline

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,

University Policy on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline

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

University Policy on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline

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](#).