

# UCSF Senate Executive Council Report

---

December 2016



**ITEM ONE. New UC Sexual Violence/Sexual Harassment (SVSH) Policy:**

The new UC policy, which substantially modifies procedures for these complaints, has some implications for our Senate Division. These complaints will be investigated by the Title IX Office. Findings of code of conduct violation will be passed on to a faculty Peer Review Committee that will make recommendations regarding discipline. The Chancellor (or designee) will then make a decision regarding disciplinary action. If the faculty member disagrees with the discipline or is to be terminated, the charges are referred to P&T for review. The new policy sets a tight timeline for the initial investigation and assignment of discipline. The complainant has new rights and will be updated regarding all Title IX, Administration and P&T outcomes, including the specifics of any sanctions or agreements with a faculty member respondent (in writing). Issues that the Senate should be aware of or consider are:

- Investigators of Title IX-related complaints undergo 80 hours training for this highly specialized work. We need to consider whether P&T should include a set number of faculty who have received this training so that the appeals process is cognizant of the key issues and methods for this kind of complaint;
- Other than an appeal to P&T, faculty will not investigate these complaints. Should the Senate seek some information from Administration on patterns of complaints and investigative findings, problems with the process, etc. This information could be provided to P&T, though as an appeal body, we might want to ask another committee to get the summaries of activity, such as EQOP.
- A confidential resource for faculty needs to be identified (at least one). This person, should be a faculty member, would discuss issues of a complaint or response, off the record, and not be a mandatory reporter. The Division should consider how many of these confidential consultants we should have, and what kinds of characteristics. Also a procedure needs to be established by which the party who requests the confidential consultation affirms in writing that they want confidentiality and not mandated reporting.
- P&T appeal is available to all faculty who are facing termination of appointment, but Adjunct and Clinical Health Sci appointees do not have the right to grieve unfair loss of privileges. Their appeal is to administration. We could try to come up with an alternative plan for this, but it is unlikely that the UCOP attorneys would provide support for P&T actions outside existing UC Bylaws.
- The plan has the Senate responsible for reporting the outcome of P&T evaluations to the complainant and the faculty respondent.



**ITEM TWO. Space:** we are still waiting for responses from administration regarding per square foot indirect recovery/building. Also we are waiting for the promised details of the distribution of donor funds (85% to people) that the Chancellor mentioned at our last Division meeting.



**ITEM THREE. Bishop Papers Funding.** I asked VC for Development, John Ford, about the prospects for obtaining the \$75,000 needed by the Library to curate the papers and post them on the web. He mentioned one potential mechanism, though I cannot determine the likelihood of this path for funding. Thus we should discuss how to accomplish the Bishop papers project AND provide needed funding for public access publication costs. One option might be to spread the costs of the Bishop papers project over two years. Half this year, and half next year. The library could still accomplish the work in one year, if they hired the curator mid-fiscal-year to mid-fiscal year (Jan1 \$37,500 and Sept 1 and additional \$37,500). This plan would encumber \$37,500 of 2017-2018 funds.



**ITEM FOUR . EC meeting this Thursday.** We need to make decisions related to the Chancellor's Fund and decisions related to the initial senate reporting projects that will be highlighted on our new web site. One option is something on possible impact of the recent election on science, health and educational funding. Another is the 95% rule, over the cap. It is likely that the EC will have good ideas about this. Also Committee Chairs should be aware that they can add materials to their Committees' web pages, and some discussion about this is likely to occur.