

## INTRODUCTION

Consistent with UC's [Anti-Discrimination Policy](#) ("A-D Policy"), the following *Investigation and Adjudication Framework for Staff and Non-Faculty Academic Personnel* ("Framework") describes the University's process for investigating and adjudicating alleged violations of the A-D Policy in instances where the Respondent is either a University employee whose conduct is governed by Personnel Policies for Staff Members ("PPSMs"), and who is subject to disciplinary and termination procedures set forth in [PPSM 62](#) (Corrective Action – Professional and Support Staff) and [PPSM 64](#) (Termination and Job Abandonment) or a non-faculty academic appointee who is subject to disciplinary procedures under the Academic Personnel Manual ("APM"), [APM-150](#) (Non-Senate Academic Appointees/Corrective Action and Dismissal) (collectively, "employee" and/or "appointee").<sup>1</sup>

More specifically, and consistent with the A-D Policy (see Section V.A.5 ("Overview of Resolution Processes") and V.A.6 ("The Formal Investigation Report and Outcome")), this *Framework* describes the University's procedures for resolving complaints of Discrimination, Harassment, and Retaliation ("Prohibited Conduct"), as defined in the A-D Policy.

This document should be read in conjunction with the A-D Policy, as well as applicable PPSMs, including PPSM 62, [PPSM 63](#) (Investigatory Leave) and PPSM 64, and applicable provisions of the APM, including APM-150.

Applicable definitions can be found in the [Anti-Discrimination Policy](#); other definitions can be found in the [PPSM Manual](#) and the [Academic Personnel \(AP\) Policy](#). These definitions are incorporated herein.

The A-D Policy's procedures apply to reports of Prohibited Conduct received by the Local Implementation Officer on or after January 1, 2026, the effective date of the procedures, regardless of when the alleged conduct occurred. When allegations of both A-D Prohibited Conduct and other allegations of employee misconduct arise out of the same or similar circumstances, then the University will address all allegations pursuant to this procedure.

*Note:* For allegations involving Sexual Harassment or Sexual Violence as defined in UC's [Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment Policy](#) (SVSH Policy), the procedures described in the [SVSH Investigation and Adjudication Framework for Staff and Non-Faculty Academic Personnel](#) apply. When allegations of both A-D and SVSH Prohibited Conduct arise out of the same

---

<sup>1</sup> For all represented staff and academic personnel who are covered by a Memorandum of Understanding with an exclusive bargaining agent, where there is a conflict with their collective bargaining agreement and this Investigation and Adjudication Framework, the collective bargaining agreement provision will apply, except as required by Federal law and regulations. When the Respondent is represented, please refer to the relevant complaint resolution, investigation, grievance, and disciplinary procedures contained in the represented Respondent's collective bargaining agreement in conjunction with this Framework.

facts or circumstances, then the University will address all allegations together under the SVSH procedure.

## **I. REPORTING OPTIONS AND RESOURCES**

The Systemwide Anti-Discrimination Director is the officer responsible for the *A-D Policy*, with ultimate oversight over the University's overall compliance with the Policy. The University also has a Local Implementation Office at each campus that is responsible for receiving and responding to reports of Prohibited Conduct under the *A-D Policy*. Confidential Resources, as defined by the *A-D Policy*, are also available at each campus both before and after a person communicates with the Local Implementation Office about potential violations of the *A-D Policy*. Confidential Resources are also available to a person who chooses not to communicate with the Local Implementation Office. As outlined in the *A-D Policy*, disclosures to Confidential Resources while they are acting in their confidential capacity are not "reports" under the Policy and will not, alone, result in any formal University action.

These reporting options and resources are available for any conduct prohibited by the *A-D Policy* ("Prohibited Conduct").

### **A. Reporting Options**

Any person may make a report, including anonymously, of Prohibited Conduct to the Local Implementation Office. The Local Implementation Office is responsible for receiving and responding to reports of Prohibited Conduct.

A person may also make a report to a Responsible Employee as defined by the *A-D Policy*. The *A-D Policy* requires a Responsible Employee who becomes aware of an incident of Prohibited Conduct to report it to the University by contacting their location's Local Implementation Officer or designee.

While there is no time limit for reporting, reports of Prohibited Conduct should be brought forward as soon as possible.

A Complainant may choose to make a report to the University and may also choose to make a report to law enforcement. A Complainant may pursue either or both of these options at the same time. Anyone who wishes to report to law enforcement can contact the UC Police Department at their location.

### **B. Confidential Resources**

The University offers access to Confidential Resources for individuals who have experienced Prohibited Conduct and are seeking counseling, emotional support, or confidential information about how to make a report to the University. University Confidential Resources are defined pursuant to the *A-D Policy* and

University of California  
A-D Investigation and Adjudication Framework for  
Senate and Non-Senate Faculty

include individuals who receive reports in their confidential capacity such as licensed counselors (e.g., Employee Assistance Program (EAP) and Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS)), and the Ombuds Office.

Confidential Resources, as defined by the *A-D Policy*, are also available at each campus both before and after a person communicates with the Local Implementation Office about potential violations of the *A-D Policy*. Confidential Resources are also available to a person who chooses not to communicate with the Local Implementation Office. These Confidential Resources are not required to report Prohibited Conduct to the Local Implementation Office, but as outlined in the *A-D Policy*, may provide information to individuals about how to contact the Local Implementation Office.

These individuals can provide confidential advice and counseling without that information being disclosed to the Local Implementation Office or law enforcement, unless there is a threat of serious harm to the individual or others or a legal obligation that requires disclosure (such as suspected abuse of a minor).

## **II. INITIAL ASSESSMENT AND GENERAL PROVISIONS**

### **Initial Assessment**

Upon receipt of a report of or information about alleged Prohibited Conduct, the Local Implementation Officer will make an initial assessment in accordance with the *A-D Policy*, which shall include making an immediate assessment concerning the health and safety of the Complainant and the campus community.

The initial assessment process described below is for all reports of Prohibited Conduct.

#### **A. Report and Response to Prohibited Conduct**

1. Consistent with the *A-D Policy*, the University may consider any person who reportedly was subjected to Prohibited Conduct a "Complainant," whether or not they make a report or participate in the investigation.
2. The University will strive to honor the stated wishes of the Complainant concerning whether to move forward with an investigation. In accordance with the *A-D Policy*, if the Complainant requests that no investigation occur, the Local Implementation Officer will determine whether the allegations, nonetheless, require an investigation to mitigate a potential risk to the campus community. See *A-D Policy* Section V.A.5.b. If the Local Implementation Officer initiates an investigation

despite the Complainant's request, they will provide Complainant with all information required by this procedure and the *A-D Policy* unless the Complainant states in writing that they do not want the information.

#### **B. University-Provided Support Services**

Throughout the resolution process, the University will offer support services for parties, for example through Counseling and Psychological Services (CAPS), the Ombuds Office, and employee assistance programs.

#### **C. Supportive Measures**

The University will also consider and implement Supportive Measures, including Interim Measures, as appropriate to protect the safety of the parties or the University community; to restore or preserve a party's access to a University program or activity; or deter Prohibited Conduct. See *A-D Policy* II.B.8 and Appendix II. The Local Implementation Officer will ensure that Supportive Measures are non-disciplinary and non-punitive, and that they do not unreasonably burden a party.

Supportive Measures for employees may include changes to a workstation, schedule, or other reasonable workplace modifications, provided that, in the case of a Complainant, the change is voluntary and equitable. Supportive Measures may also include, but are not limited to, no contact orders and counseling. Additional information about Supportive Measures is included in Appendix II of the *A-D Policy*.

Investigatory leave of a PPSM-covered Respondent may be imposed in accordance with PPSM 63. Investigatory leave of a non-faculty academic Respondent may be imposed in accordance with APM-150.

#### **D. Advisors and Support Persons**

At all stages of this process, the Complainant and Respondent (also known as the parties) have the right to an advisor of their choosing, as well as the right to a support person of their choosing. Student Complainants also have right to request that the University provide an advisor to the student. The advisor and/or the support person may be any person (including an advocate, attorney, friend, or parent) who is not otherwise a party or a witness.

1. The advisor's primary role is to provide guidance to the Complainant or Respondent throughout the process. The advisor may not speak on behalf of a party at any meeting or interview.
2. The support person's primary role is to provide emotional support. The support person may not speak on behalf of a party at any

University of California  
A-D Investigation and Adjudication Framework for  
Senate and Non-Senate Faculty

meeting or interview.

3. Advisors and support persons may not disrupt any meetings or proceedings in any manner. At all stages of the process, advisors and support persons must comply with the University's rules of conduct for participants in this process ("A-D Rules of Conduct"). The University reserves the right to exclude an advisor and/or support person who does not abide by all these procedures.

**E. Written Rights & Options**

The Local Implementation Officer will ensure that the Complainant, if their identity is known, is provided a written explanation of rights and available options as outlined in the *A-D Policy*, including:

1. how and to whom to report alleged violations;
2. options for reporting to and/or notifying law enforcement and campus authorities;
3. information regarding confidential resources;
4. when applicable, the importance of preserving evidence that may assist in proving that a criminal offense occurred or in obtaining a protection order;
5. counseling, health, mental health, legal assistance, visa and immigration assistance, and other services available both within the institution and the community;
6. options for a change to academic, living, transportation, and working situations if the Complainant requests and if such options are reasonably available—regardless of whether the Complainant chooses to report the alleged conduct to law enforcement; and
7. the range of possible outcomes of the report, including supportive and remedial measures and disciplinary or corrective actions, the procedures leading to such outcomes, and their right to make a complaint.

**F. Closure After Initial Assessment**

Reports are not the same as a complaint. Not all reports the Local Implementation Officer receives are appropriate for formal investigation and resolution. If the Local Implementation Officer determines that closure of the case is appropriate under Section V.A.4 of the *A-D Policy*, the Local Implementation Officer may close the case and proceed as set forth in the *A-D Policy*.

## **General Provisions**

### **G. Party Participation**

Neither the Complainant nor the Respondent is required to participate in the process outlined in these procedures. The University will not draw any adverse inferences from a Complainant or Respondent's decision not to participate or to remain silent during the process. An investigator will reach findings and conclusions based on the information available.

### **H. Selective Participation**

When a party selectively participates in the process—such as choosing to answer some but not all questions posed, or choosing to provide a statement only after reviewing the other evidence gathered in the investigation—an investigator may consider the selective participation in evaluating the party's credibility. In doing so, they should try to discern reasonable non-adverse explanations for the selective participation, including from the parties' own explanations, and determine whether the information available supports those explanations.

### **I. University's Neutral Role**

In all cases, including where the Complainant chooses not to participate or where there is no Complainant as provided for in the *A-D Policy* (II.B.1), the University's role is neutral, and it will conduct any factfinding and sanctioning without taking the position of either party.

### **J. Case Management**

The Local Implementation Officer or their designee will track all stages of the investigation and adjudication under this procedure.

### **K. Training**

All University officials involved in this investigation will be trained to carry out their roles in a fair, unbiased, and impartial manner.

### **L. Standard of Proof**

The standard of proof for factfinding and determining whether a policy violation(s) occurred is Preponderance of Evidence, as defined by the *A-D Policy*. A Respondent will not be found responsible for a violation of the *A-D Policy* and/or other employee conduct policies unless the evidence establishes it is more likely than not that they violated the *A-D Policy* and/or other employee conduct policies.

### **M. Extension of Deadlines**

The Local Implementation Officer may extend any deadlines

contained in this procedure consistent with the *A-D Policy*, as applicable, and for good cause shown and documented. The Complainant and Respondent will be notified in writing of any extension, the reasons for it, and projected new timelines.

**N. Disability-Related Accommodations**

The Local Implementation Officer will consider requests from parties and witnesses for disability-related accommodations in the investigation and adjudication process in consultation with the appropriate University office, such as the ADA Coordinator.

**O. Requests for Language Interpretation**

The Local Implementation Officer will consider requests from parties and witnesses for language interpretation.

**III. INVESTIGATING AND RESOLVING REPORTS OF PROHIBITED CONDUCT**

Provided the University has sufficient information to respond, and in accordance with the *A-D Policy*, the University may resolve reports of alleged Prohibited Conduct by Respondents covered by this *Framework* through Alternative Resolution or Formal Investigation.

**A. Alternative Resolution**

After a preliminary inquiry into the facts, if the Complainant and Respondent agree in writing, the Local Implementation Officer may<sup>2</sup> initiate an Alternative Resolution in accordance with the *A-D Policy*. Alternative Resolution is not available when the Complainant is a student and the Respondent is an employee.

**B. Formal Investigation**

In cases where Alternative Resolution is inappropriate or unsuccessful, the Local Implementation Officer may conduct a Formal Investigation pursuant to the *A-D Policy*.

**1. Commencing a Formal Investigation**

A Formal Investigation begins on the date the Local Implementation Officer sends the parties written notice of the allegations to be investigated.

**2. Notification**

---

<sup>2</sup> The Local Implementation Officer has discretion to determine whether the complaint is appropriate for Alternative Resolution, to determine the type of resolution to pursue, and to stop the process at any time before its conclusion and move to a Formal Investigation. Circumstances when a Local Implementation Officer may decline to allow Alternative Resolution include, but are not limited to, when the alleged conduct would present a future risk of harm to others or when there is a potential power imbalance between the parties.

University of California  
A-D Investigation and Adjudication Framework for  
Senate and Non-Senate Faculty

The Local Implementation Officer will notify the Chancellor and/or the Chancellor's designee and the Respondent's supervisor or other appropriate administrative appointee when a Formal Investigation is commenced against a Respondent. The Local Implementation Officer will be sensitive in their communication to protect the neutrality of the Chancellor and/or the Chancellor's designee and the neutrality of the supervisor or other appropriate administrative appointee, as well as the privacy of the Complainant and Respondent.

Thereafter, the Local Implementation Officer will regularly communicate with the Chancellor and/or the Chancellor's designee and/or supervisor or other appropriate administrative appointee regarding the status of the Formal Investigation.

3. Written Notice of Investigation

If a Formal Investigation will be conducted, the Local Implementation Officer will concurrently send written notice of the allegations to the Complainant and the Respondent. The written notice will be sent a reasonable time in advance of the party's requested interview date, to allow sufficient time for the party to prepare for the interview. The written notice will include:

- a. a summary of the reported conduct that potentially violated the *A-D Policy* and, where applicable, other employee conduct policies;
- b. the identities of the parties involved;
- c. the date, time, and location of the reported incident(s) (to the extent known);
- d. The specific provisions of the *A-D Policy* and any employee conduct policy potentially violated;
- e. a statement that each party may have an advisor and a support person of their choice throughout the process, as described above;
- f. where the Complainant is a student, a statement that the student has the right to request that the University provide an advisor to the student, who with the student's written permission, will receive updates along with the student during the process;
- g. a statement that the investigation report, when issued, will make factual findings and a determination whether there has been a violation of the *A-D Policy* and/or any employee conduct policy;
- h. a statement that the parties will each have an opportunity



University of California  
A-D Investigation and Adjudication Framework for  
Senate and Non-Senate Faculty

during the investigation to identify witnesses and submit relevant evidence;

- i. a statement that it is a violation of University policy to furnish false information to the University, but that an investigator's determination regarding responsibility that is inconsistent with the information that a party furnished does not, in and of itself, indicate that such information was false;
- j. a statement that the parties will each have an opportunity, before the completion of the investigation, to review the relevant evidence collected, or a preliminary written investigation report that accurately summarizes evidence determined by the investigator to be relevant to whether a policy violation occurred;
- k. a statement that the factual findings and determination under the *A-D Policy* will be based on the preponderance of the evidence standard;
- l. a statement that the Respondent is presumed not responsible until a determination of whether a policy violation has occurred is made at the conclusion of the process and only after the parties have had an opportunity to present relevant evidence to a trained, impartial decisionmaker;
- m. a summary of the investigation process and the expected timeline;
- n. a summary of the rights of the Complainant and respondent;
- o. a description of the resources available to Complainant and Respondent; and
- p. a statement that retaliation is prohibited.

At any point during the investigation, the Local Implementation Officer may amend the notice to add additional allegations identified during the investigation. Any amended notice should include all the information described above. If the additional allegations identified during the investigation include conduct prohibited under the *SVSH Policy*, then the Local Implementation Officer will notify the parties that the case will now proceed under the University's procedures for resolving complaints of Prohibited Conduct under the *SVSH Policy*.

4. Investigative Process

The Local Implementation Officer will oversee the investigation and designate an investigator to conduct a fair, thorough, and impartial investigation. The burden of gathering evidence sufficient to reach a determination regarding whether violation(s)

University of California  
A-D Investigation and Adjudication Framework for  
Senate and Non-Senate Faculty

of the *A-D Policy* occurred rests with the investigator. Absent an extension for good cause, the Local Implementation Office will strive to complete its investigation within sixty (60) to ninety (90) business days from the date of the written Notice of Investigation.

a. **Overview:**

- i. During the investigation, the Complainant and Respondent will be provided an equal opportunity to meet with the investigator, submit information, identify witnesses who may have relevant information, and propose questions for the investigator to ask the other party and witnesses.
- ii. The investigator has discretion to determine which witnesses to interview based on the relevance of the evidence they allegedly would offer, and to determine what questions to ask, and will decline to ask questions that are irrelevant, repetitive, or that would violate the *A-D Policy* Rules of Conduct.
- iii. The investigator will meet separately with the Complainant, the Respondent, and the witnesses and will gather other available and relevant evidence. The investigator may follow up with the Complainant or the Respondent and witnesses as needed to clarify any inconsistencies or new information gathered during the course of the investigation.
- iv. The investigator will generally consider or rely on all evidence they determine to be relevant and reliable, including evidence that weighs in favor of and against a determination that a policy violation occurred. The investigator may determine the relevance and weigh the value of any witness or other evidence to the findings and may exclude evidence that is irrelevant or immaterial.
- v. The investigator will generally consider direct observations and reasonable inferences from the facts.
- vi. The investigator will not consider statements of personal opinion as to anyone's general reputation or any character trait as such information is not relevant to whether a Respondent more likely than not engaged in conduct that violates the *A-D Policy*.
- vii. The investigator may consider prior or subsequent conduct of the Respondent in determining pattern, knowledge, intent, motive, or absence of mistake. For example, evidence of a pattern of Prohibited Conduct or

University of California  
A-D Investigation and Adjudication Framework for  
Senate and Non-Senate Faculty

other conduct prohibited by employee conduct policies by the Respondent, either before or after the incident in question, regardless of whether there has been a prior finding of an *A-D Policy* or other policy violation, may be deemed relevant to the determination of responsibility for the Prohibited Conduct or related employee conduct policy violation under investigation.

- viii. It is the investigator's role to assess a party's or witness's credibility to the extent credibility is both in dispute and relevant to evaluating one or more allegations of Prohibited Conduct. Any credibility determinations will not be based on a person's status as a Complainant, Respondent, or witness.
- ix. The investigator will objectively evaluate all relevant evidence, including both inculpatory and exculpatory evidence.
- x. Disclosure of facts to persons interviewed will be limited to what is reasonably necessary to conduct a fair and thorough investigation. Participants in an investigation may be counseled about keeping information private to protect the integrity of the investigation.

**b. Clinical records**

As applicable, the investigator and any other University officials involved in the resolution process will not access, review, consider, disclose, or otherwise use a party's medical or behavioral health records that are made in connection with treatment without the party's voluntary written consent.

**c. Privileged Records**

As applicable, the investigator and any other University officials involved in the resolution process will not access, review, consider, disclose, or otherwise use evidence that constitutes, or seeks disclosure of, information protected under privilege recognized by federal or state law without the written consent of the person to whom the privilege is owed.

**d. Coordination with Law Enforcement**

When a law enforcement agency is conducting its own investigation into the alleged conduct, the investigator should coordinate their fact-finding efforts with the law enforcement investigation in accordance with the *A-D Policy* (See *A-D Policy* Section V.A.5.b.1 and FAQ 8). A reasonable delay resulting from such coordination may be good cause for

extending the timelines to complete the investigation. If so, the delay will be communicated and documented in accordance with the *A-D Policy*.

**e. Equal Opportunity to Review and Respond**

Before the investigator concludes the investigation and finalizes a written investigation report, the parties will have an equal opportunity to review and respond to either: 1) the evidence that the investigator has deemed relevant, including statements made by the parties or witnesses, or 2) a preliminary written investigation report that accurately summarizes this evidence.

This is true regardless of whether a party has participated in the investigation. The Local Implementation Officer will ensure that this review occurs in a manner designed to protect the privacy of both parties.

The Local Implementation Officer will designate a reasonable time for this review and response by the parties. If a party has an identified Advisor of record, they will also be provided access to review the relevant evidence; however, only the parties themselves may submit a response. The investigator has discretion to revise the written report to reflect the parties' responses.

**5. Investigation Report**

Following conclusion of the investigation, the investigator will prepare a written report that includes the factual allegations and alleged policy violations, statements of the parties and witnesses, a summary of the evidence the investigator considered, findings of fact, credibility determinations when appropriate, an analysis of whether a policy violation has occurred, and a determination regarding whether there are any policy violations. If credibility determinations were not necessary to reach the findings and policy determinations, the report will so note and explain why. The investigator may consult with the appropriate academic officer on matters involving academic freedom.

If the Complainant or Respondent offered witnesses or other evidence that was not considered by the investigator, the investigation report will include an explanation of why it was not considered. The investigation report should also indicate when and how the parties were given an opportunity to review the evidence. The investigation report will include an analysis and determination of each allegation included in the Notice of Investigation.

6. Notice of Determination and Report

Upon completion of the investigation, the Local Implementation Officer will simultaneously provide to the Complainant and the Respondent (a) a written notice of the factual findings and determinations, and (b) the investigation report. The investigator may consult with the appropriate administrative authority on the determinations regarding violations of employment conduct policies other than the *A-D Policy*. The investigation report may be redacted to protect privacy.

The Local Implementation Officer or designee will also send the notice of factual findings, determination, and accompanying investigation report to the Chancellor and/or the Chancellor's designee and the supervisor or other appropriate administrative authority.

The notice of factual findings and determinations will include the following:

- a. a summary of the allegations that would constitute Prohibited Conduct under the *A-D Policy*, and any other related employee conduct violations;
- b. the investigator's evaluation of the relevant evidence;
- c. a summary statement of the factual findings and determinations regarding whether the *A-D Policy* or other employee conduct policies have been violated;
- d. the rationale for the determination of each allegation;
- e. a statement that each party has an opportunity to respond in writing to the Chancellor and/or the Chancellor's designee and/or supervisors or other appropriate administrative authority;
- f. a statement of whether it appears that further investigation by another appropriate University office may be necessary to determine whether violations of other policies occurred, separate from any allegations of Prohibited Conduct under the *A-D Policy*;
- g. a prohibition against retaliation;
- h. an explanation of any Supportive Measures that will remain in place; and
- i. a statement that the Complainant and the Respondent will be informed of the final resolution of the matter, including that appropriate action will be taken, if applicable, and a statement of the anticipated timeline.

If a determination is made that a policy violation occurred, the

University of California  
A-D Investigation and Adjudication Framework for  
Senate and Non-Senate Faculty

Local Implementation Officer will determine whether Complainant, and, to the extent appropriate, others identified to be experiencing the effects of any Prohibited Conduct, will be provided additional remedies, and will inform Complainant, or others, of that determination. Respondents are not notified of such measures unless necessary to implement the measure.

For matters involving PPSM-covered Respondents, a description of the process for deciding whether and what discipline or corrective action to impose, including a statement that the supervisor will propose a resolution, which may include corrective action as defined by PPSM - 62 or termination in accordance with PPSM - 64, and that the proposal will be subject to review and approval by the Chancellor and/or the Chancellor's designee.

For matters involving non-faculty academic Respondents, a description of the process for deciding whether and what discipline or corrective action to impose, including a statement that the supervisor or other appropriate administrative authority will propose a resolution, which may include corrective action or dismissal as described in APM - 150, and that the proposal will be subject to review and approval by the Chancellor and/or the Chancellor's designee.

7. Access to Certain Investigation Records

After issuance of the investigator's written report, the investigation file, consisting of the investigation report and any evidence deemed relevant by the investigator (as documented in the investigation report and/or exhibits), must be retained by the Local Implementation Officer and made available to the parties for inspection upon request. It may be redacted to protect privacy.

8. Administrative Closures

If at any time during the investigation, the Local Implementation Officer determines that dismissal of the complaint is appropriate under Section V.A.4 of the *A-D Policy* or administrative closure is appropriate under Section V.A.5.b, the Local Implementation officer may dismiss the complaint or close the investigation and proceed as set forth in the *A-D Policy*.

#### **IV. ASSESSMENT AND CONSULTATION**

In cases where the investigator determines a policy violation occurred, the Respondent's supervisor or other appropriate administrative authority has the responsibility to propose and implement action in response to the findings of

University of California  
A-D Investigation and Adjudication Framework for  
Senate and Non-Senate Faculty

the investigation report. The proposed decision by the supervisor or other appropriate administrative authority will be reviewed and approved by the Chancellor and/or the Chancellor's designee. The supervisor or other appropriate administrative authority may determine that additional investigation is required to determine whether violations of other policies occurred but will not reinvestigate allegations of Prohibited Conduct investigated by the Local Implementation Office.

The Chancellor and/or the Chancellor's designee, as well as the supervisor or other appropriate administrative authority, may consult with the Local Implementation Office, Staff Human Resources, or the Academic Personnel Office, or any other appropriate entities at any time during the decision-making process.

**A. Opportunity to Respond**

The Complainant and the Respondent will have an opportunity to respond to the notice of determination and accompanying investigation report through a written statement that will be submitted to the Respondent's supervisor or other appropriate administrative authority and the Chancellor and/or the Chancellor's designee. The parties will have five (5) business days after the Local Implementation Officer sends the investigation report to respond.

The purpose of this response is not to challenge the factual findings in the investigation report or present new evidence, but to provide the Complainant and the Respondent with an opportunity to express their perspectives and address what outcome they wish to see.

**B. Decision Proposal and Submission for Approval**

In the event that the investigation determines that a Respondent is responsible for violating the *A-D Policy*, the Respondent's supervisor or other appropriate administrative authority will propose a decision regarding how to resolve the matter. The proposal must be submitted to the Chancellor and/or the Chancellor's designee for review and approval.

In the event the Chancellor and/or the Chancellor's designee does not approve the proposed decision, they will send it back to the supervisor or other appropriate administrative authority for reconsideration and submission of a revised proposed decision.

Additionally, the Chancellor and/or the Chancellor's designee will consult with the Local Implementation Officer on the appropriateness of the proposed decision before approving or disapproving it.

In the event the Chancellor and/or the Chancellor's designee

approves the proposed decision, they will inform the supervisor or other appropriate administrative authority who will take steps to implement the approved decision.

This proposal and approval process will occur in all cases where the investigation has determined the Respondent violated the *A-D Policy* pursuant to these procedures. Staff Human Resources or the Academic Personnel Office will be consulted throughout the process.

## **V. CORRECTIVE OR OTHER ACTIONS**

The below provisions apply when a Respondent is found in violation of the *A-D Policy* following an investigation.

### **A. PPSM Covered Staff: Decision Approval and Implementation**

Following approval by the Chancellor and/or the Chancellor's designee, the Respondent's supervisor will implement the approved decision in accordance with applicable PPSMs, including PPSM - 62 and PPSM - 64.

#### **1. No Further Action**

The supervisor may propose to resolve the matter without taking any further action. This proposal will be reviewed by the Chancellor and/or the Chancellor's designee for approval. In the event it is approved, this decision and its rationale will be promptly communicated to the Respondent, and the Complainant will concurrently be notified of the outcome, including that appropriate action has been taken.

#### **2. Action Not Requiring Notice of Intent**

The supervisor may propose corrective or remedial actions that do not amount to corrective action as defined by PPSM - 62 or termination under PPSM - 64. The proposed actions will be reviewed by the Chancellor and/or the Chancellor's designee for approval.

In the event it is approved, the decision will be implemented by the supervisor and the decision and its terms and rationale will be promptly communicated to the Respondent, and the Complainant will concurrently be notified of the outcome, including that appropriate action has been taken.

#### **3. Notice of Intent**

The supervisor may propose to issue a notice of intent to institute corrective action in accordance with PPSM - 62 or notice of intent to terminate in accordance with PPSM - 64. The proposed terms of the notice of intent will be reviewed by the



Chancellor and/or the Chancellor's designee for approval. In the event it is approved, the decision will be implemented by the supervisor and the notice of intent will issue.

Following the provision of a notice of intent, corrective action will be taken in accordance with PPSM - 62 and/or actions to terminate will be taken in accordance with PPSM – 64 or relevant collective bargaining agreement. The terms of the implemented action and its rationale will be promptly communicated to the Respondent, and the Complainant will be concurrently notified of the outcome, including that appropriate action has been taken.

## **B. Non-Faculty Academic Personnel: Decision Approval and Implementation**

Following approval by the Chancellor and/or the Chancellor's designee, the Respondent's supervisor or other appropriate administrative authority will implement the approved action in accordance with APM - 150.

### **1. No Further Action**

The supervisor or appropriate administrative authority may propose to resolve the matter without taking any further action. This proposal will be reviewed by the Chancellor and/or the Chancellor's designee for approval. In the event it is approved, this decision and its rationale will be promptly communicated to the Respondent, and the Complainant will be concurrently notified of the outcome, including that appropriate action has been taken.

### **2. Informal Resolution**

The supervisor or appropriate administrative authority may propose an informal resolution in accordance with APM - 150, which may include discipline and/or other corrective or remedial measures. The proposed informal resolution and its terms will be reviewed by the Chancellor and/or the Chancellor's designee for approval. Informal resolution can be achieved at any time prior to the final imposition of dismissal or corrective action.

In the event the informal resolution is approved and agreed to by the Respondent, the Complainant will be promptly informed of the outcome, including that appropriate action has been taken; as appropriate, the Complainant will be notified of specific terms that relate to any action with respect to the Complainant.

### **3. Notice of Intent**

The supervisor or other appropriate administrative authority may propose to issue a notice of intent instituting dismissal or other

corrective action in accordance with APM - 150. The proposed terms of the notice of intent shall be reviewed by the Chancellor and/or the Chancellor's designee for approval.

Following the provision of a notice of intent, corrective action or termination will be implemented in accordance with APM - 150. The terms of the implemented action and its rationale will be promptly communicated to the Respondent, and the Complainant will be notified of the outcome, including that appropriate action has been taken.

#### **C. Timeframe for Implementation of Decision; Extension for Good Cause**

The supervisor or other appropriate administrative authority should implement their approved decision promptly, typically within forty (40) business days of receipt of the notice of determination and accompanying investigation report. If the matter has not been otherwise resolved within forty (40) business days, a notice of intent will be issued.

Extensions to this timeline may be granted by the Chancellor and/or the Chancellor's designee for good cause with written notice to the Complainant and the Respondent stating the reason for the extension and the projected new timeline.

### **VI. PROCESS FOLLOWING ACTION TAKEN**

The below provisions apply when a Respondent is found in violation of the *A-D Policy* following an investigation.

In the event that a PPSM-covered Respondent submits a complaint under [PPSM-70](#), or a non-faculty academic appointee Respondent submits a grievance under [APM-140](#), the Chancellor and/or the Chancellor's designee will ensure that both the Complainant and the Respondent receive regular updates regarding the status of the complaint or grievance.

The Complainant may follow processes appropriate to their own personnel or student policies.

Subsequent to any final decision, the Chancellor and/or the Chancellor's designee will promptly inform the Respondent of the decision, including any final decision on discipline, and its rationale, as appropriate, and concurrently notify the Complainant of the outcome, including that appropriate action has been taken.

#### **A. Range of Sanctions (Discipline and/or Corrective Action)**

The following is a list of the range of potential discipline or corrective actions:

1. termination of, or dismissal from, employment from the

University of California  
A-D Investigation and Adjudication Framework for  
Senate and Non-Senate Faculty

University of California;

2. suspension from the University of California;
3. demotion;
4. reduction in salary;
5. denial or curtailment of emeritus status;
6. exclusion from areas of the campus and/or from official University functions;
7. loss of privileges and/or exclusion from activities;
8. probation;
9. censure/warning;
10. no-contact orders; and/or
11. other actions as set forth in University policy and campus regulations.

In contrast to Supportive Measures, which may not be disciplinary or punitive and may not unreasonably burden a party, discipline or corrective actions may impose greater burdens on a Respondent found responsible for *A-D Policy* violations.

Assigned discipline or corrective actions for each case will be documented and reported to the Systemwide Anti-Discrimination Director on a regular basis. The report is to ensure a reasonable level of consistency from campus to campus in similar circumstances.

Policies regarding discipline and corrective action are found in APM - 150, APM – 390, PPSM - 62, and PPSM – 64 or relevant collective bargaining agreement.