

UC RIVERSIDE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA | **Academic Senate**
COMMITTEE ON DIVERSITY & EQUAL OPPORTUNITY

March 4, 2016

To: Jose Wudka, Chair
Riverside Division of the Academic Senate

From: Manuela Martins-Green, Chair 
Committee on Diversity & Equal Opportunity

Re: Report from the Joint Committee of Administration and Academic Senate

At its meeting on March 3, 2016, the Committee on Diversity and Equal Opportunity considered the report from the Joint Committee of the Administration and Academic Senate and provided the following comments:

The Joint Committee of the Administration and Academic Senate, charged with examining University disciplinary proceedings in cases of sexual violence, assault and harassment, has concluded that “the systemwide and campus policies are clearly written and reasonable” (p. 1). The Committee’s recommendations for adjustments relating to language, procedure (e.g., on the place of Title IX investigations), educational outreach, faculty rights, etc. are very reasonable and entirely acceptable. However, the report only touches upon an important question that in CoDEO’s opinion is not sufficiently addressed. How will the University deal with the two most common concerns raised by complainants, that is, the length and confidentiality of the disciplinary process which has given rise to “a perception that both fosters a culture of impunity and discourages reporting” (p. 5)? What will be done in the future to avoid “discouraging complainants from reporting” (p. 5)? A 1995 report by the Disciplinary Procedures Task Force made the recommendation “that the disciplinary process be expedited...” and called for “increased participation by the complainant in faculty disciplinary actions” (p. 33). Considering the findings of the 2013 Climate Study, which indicates that 3% of respondents (and a higher percentage of students) “believed they have experienced unwanted sexual contact while at a UC campus/location” (p. 33), it would seem very important to look more deeply into how common concerns raised by complainants can best be addressed. The proposed appointment of “a single individual in the Chancellor’s Office ...to provide complainants with updates” (p. 9) would be a welcome first step. But what other efforts will be made in the future “to protect and assist complainants” (p. 10)?