



Whistleblower Policies and Procedures

CONTENTS

I. POLICY REFERENCES.....	2
II. OVERVIEW.....	2
III. DEFINITIONS.....	3
IV. AUTHORITY.....	4
V. LOCALLY DESIGNATED OFFICIAL (LDO).....	4
VI. INVESTIGATIONS WORKGROUP (I-GROUP).....	5
VII. REPORTING ALLEGATIONS OF SUSPECTED IMPROPER GOVERNMENTAL ACTIVITIES.....	6
VIII. RECORDS.....	12
IX. RESPONSE TO WHISTLEBLOWER.....	12
APPENDIX A.....	13

I. POLICY REFERENCES

[University of California Policy on Reporting and Investigating Allegations of Suspected Improper Governmental Activities](#) (Whistleblower Policy)

[University of California Policy for Protection of Whistleblowers from Retaliation and Guidelines for Reviewing Retaliation Complaints](#) (Whistleblower Protection Policy)

II. OVERVIEW

- A.** The University of California has implemented the Policy on Reporting and Investigating Allegations of Suspected Improper Governmental Activities (Whistleblower Policy). This policy governs the reporting and investigating of allegations of suspected improper governmental activities, defined as: “an activity by a state agency or by an employee that is undertaken in the performance of the employee’s duties, undertaken inside a state office, or, if undertaken outside a state office by the employee, directly relates to state government, whether or not that activity is within the scope of his or her employment, and that (1) is in violation of any state or federal law or regulation, including, but not limited to, corruption, malfeasance, bribery, theft of government property, fraudulent claims, fraud, coercion, conversion, malicious prosecution, misuse of government property, or willful omission to perform duty, or (2) is in violation of an Executive order of the Governor, a California Rule of Court, or any policy or procedure mandated by the State Administrative Manual or State Contracting Manual, or (3) is economically wasteful, involves gross misconduct, incompetency, or inefficiency.” (See California Government Code Section 8547.2 (c))
- B.** This document outlines the Santa Cruz campus’s policies and procedures for implementing the University of California’s Whistleblower Policy (and provisions of California Government Code Section 8547.2), and should be read in concert with that policy, which outlines the rights and responsibilities of University employees, applicants, and others when making protected disclosures.
- C.** When a person reports allegations of suspected improper governmental activities to an appropriate authority, the report is known as a protected disclosure. The rights of University employees and applicants for employment are covered in a separate document, University of California Policy for Protection of Whistleblowers from Retaliation and Guidelines for Reviewing Retaliation Complaints (Whistleblower Protection Policy).
- D.** Any allegations of improper governmental activities that may result in subsequent actions bringing disciplinary charges against an academic or staff member shall be handled according to the applicable academic or staff personnel conduct and disciplinary policies and procedures. Nothing contained in these implementing procedures should be read or interpreted to contradict the University of California Policy on Reporting and Investigating Allegations of Suspected Improper Governmental Activities (Whistleblower Policy).

III. DEFINITIONS

A. Illegal Order. According to California Government Code Section 8547.2(b), an *illegal order* means:

“a directive to violate or assist in violating a federal, state, or local law, rule, or regulation, or an order to work or cause others to work in conditions outside of their line of duty that would unreasonably threaten the health or safety of employees or the public.”

B. Improper Governmental Activities. According to California Government Code Section 8547.2 (c), *improper governmental activity* means:

“ an activity by a state agency or by an employee that is undertaken in the performance of the employee’s duties, undertaken inside a state office, or, if undertaken outside a state office by the employee, directly relates to state government, whether or not that activity is within the scope of his or her employment, and that (1) is in violation of any state or federal law or regulation, including, but not limited to, corruption, malfeasance, bribery, theft of government property, fraudulent claims, fraud, coercion, conversion, malicious prosecution, misuse of government property, or willful omission to perform duty, or (2) is in violation of an Executive order of the Governor, a California Rule of Court, or any policy or procedure mandated by the State Administrative Manual or State Contracting Manual, or (3) is economically wasteful, involves gross misconduct, incompetency, or inefficiency.”

C. Protected Disclosure. According to California Government Code Section 8547.2(e), a *protected disclosure* means:

“a good faith communication, including a communication based on, or when carrying out, job duties, that discloses or demonstrates an intention to disclose information that may evidence (1) an improper governmental activity or, (2) a condition that may significantly threaten the health or safety of employees or the public if the disclosure or intention to disclose was made for the purpose of remedying that condition.”

For a communication to qualify as a protected disclosure, as defined for the whistleblower policies, the whistleblower must submit “original information”. Such information must be derived from the whistleblower’s independent knowledge or independent analysis and must not be already known within the University of California or the University of California, Santa Cruz.

- “Independent knowledge” means factual information in the whistleblower’s possession that is not derived from publicly available sources. The whistleblower may gain “independent knowledge” from experiences, communications, and observations in business and social situations.
- “Independent analysis” means the whistleblower’s own analysis whether done alone or in combination with others. Analysis means the whistleblower’s examination and evaluation of information that may be publicly available, but which reveals information that is not generally known or available to the public.

D. University Resources. For purposes of this policy, the term *University Resources* is defined to include, but not be limited to the following, whether owned by or under the management of the University:

- Cash and other assets, whether tangible or intangible; real or personal property;
- Receivables and other rights or claims against third parties;
- Intellectual property rights;
- Effort of University personnel and of any non-University entity billing the University for its effort;
- Facilities and the rights to use of University facilities;
- The University's name; and
- University records, including student and patient records

E. Whistleblower. A person or entity making a protected disclosure is commonly referred to as whistleblower. Whistleblowers may be University employees (academic or staff), applicants for employment, students, patients, vendors, contractors or the general public. The whistleblower's role is as a reporting party. They are not investigators or finders of fact, nor do they determine the appropriate corrective or remedial action that may be warranted.

IV. AUTHORITY

- A.** The Chancellor is responsible for the overall coordination and implementation of the UC Whistleblower Policy at the UC Santa Cruz campus.
- B.** The Chancellor appoints the Associate Chancellor as the Locally Designated Official ("LDO"), and delegates to the LDO the authority for coordinating and implementing the Whistleblower Policy. This authority may be re-delegated in whole or in part at the discretion of the LDO.
- C.** The Chancellor appoints the Investigations Workgroup members (see Section VI).

V. LOCALLY DESIGNATED OFFICIAL (LDO)

The LDO is the campus authority on the Procedure for Reporting and Investigating Allegations of Suspected Improper Governmental Activities, and is responsible for the following:

1. Establishing and maintaining local implementing procedures and administrative guidelines for the Whistleblower Policy;
2. Receiving initial reports of allegations of suspected improper governmental activities;
3. Establishing campus reporting processes for whistleblower investigations, including ensuring that reporting requirements to the Office of the President and campus senior management are met;
4. Serving as chair of the Investigations Workgroup (the I-Group);
5. Convening the I-Group on a scheduled and ad hoc basis to assist in addressing allegations and coordinating investigative activities;
6. Determining the need for consultation with either the I-Group, a subset of I-Group members, or other subject matter experts when initiating, or during the conduct of, an investigation;

UC Santa Cruz Whistleblower Policies and Procedures

7. Receiving and reviewing monthly reports from the investigating units on the progress and status of investigations;
8. Ensuring that appropriate resources and expertise are engaged to conduct timely and thorough investigation of whistleblower reports;
9. Ensuring that there are no conflicts of interest on the part of any individual involved in investigating a whistleblower complaint; and
10. Annually publishing a report of campus investigative activities related to whistleblower reports for the Chancellor and the UCSC Internal Audit Committee.
11. The LDO, in consultation with appropriate members of the Investigations Workgroup, will appoint an acting LDO for any report that creates a perceived or actual conflict of interest for the LDO. Normally the acting LDO will be a member of the Investigations Workgroup but in some circumstances may be a University employee with particular expertise related to the report.

VI. INVESTIGATIONS WORKGROUP (I-GROUP)

- A. Members of the I-Group include representatives from each functional unit that has routine responsibility for certain types of investigations, including the LDO, Chief Campus Counsel, Director of Internal Audit and the Director Harassment & Investigations Office/Title IX Officer. In addition, specialized expertise may be required on an ad hoc basis for certain matters.
- B. The I-Group's purpose is to provide advice to the LDO regarding oversight and coordination of investigative activities. When requested by the LDO, the I-Group's responsibilities can include:
 1. Advising the LDO on investigative channels to be used and assignment of investigations in keeping with appropriate expertise, jurisdiction, and conflict of interest considerations;
 2. Advising the LDO on whether a plan to address reported improper governmental activities is appropriate to the circumstances;
 3. Assisting the LDO in coordinating cases that involve overlapping interest among investigative units (those units with routine responsibility for certain types of investigations – See VI.A);
 4. Meeting on a regular basis as determined by the LDO, and on an ad hoc basis when requested by the LDO, in order to provide advice with regard to investigative activities and to assist the LDO in ensuring that campus processes and procedures are functioning in a timely, effective, and efficient manner;
 5. Making recommendations to improve the timing, effectiveness and efficiency of campus investigations activities.

VII. REPORTING ALLEGATIONS OF SUSPECTED IMPROPER GOVERNMENTAL ACTIVITIES

A. Making a Whistleblower Report

1. Allegations of suspected improper governmental activities may be made by any person including university staff, faculty, student or academic employees, applicants for employment, registered students, vendors, contractors, or the general public. Anonymous reports are also permitted; however, because investigators are unable to interview anonymous whistleblowers, it may be more difficult to evaluate the credibility of the allegations and therefore, less likely to cause an investigation to be initiated.
2. Reports of allegations of suspected improper governmental activities are encouraged to be made in writing so as to assure a clear understanding of the issues raised, but may be made orally. Such reports should be factual rather than speculative or conclusory, and contain as much specific information as possible to allow for proper assessment of the nature, extent and urgency of preliminary investigative procedures. A [UCSC Whistleblower Report Form](http://whistleblower.ucsc.edu) is located at <http://whistleblower.ucsc.edu>.
3. Whistleblower reports may be made to a University-wide Whistleblower Hotline, which is independently operated to help ensure confidentiality. These reports will be reviewed by the LDO. The LDO determines whether an investigation is required and/or determines the need for consultation with the I-Group or subset of I-Group when reviewing a matter for investigation. If the report is to be investigated, the LDO and the I-Group will coordinate the investigation. The University of California Whistleblower Hotline number is 800-403-4744; please click on the appropriate UC campus at URL: <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/hotline>.
4. Any university employee may make a report to his or her immediate supervisor or other appropriate administrator within their unit or to any of the campus investigative units listed in Appendix A. If a report is made orally, the employee is encouraged to make clear to their supervisor that he or she is making a protected disclosure and that this is not a routine discussion of unit business matters. If the complaint is about the employee's supervisor, then the report should be made to a higher-level supervisor or other appropriate campus official.
5. Any university employee may consult with the UCSC Conflict Resolution Services, licensed counselors in the Employee Assistance Program and/or licensed counselors at Counseling & Psychological Services at Student Health Center for advice and information on the procedure for filing a whistleblower or retaliation report. However, discussions in these settings are not considered whistleblower or retaliation reports to the university, and the discussions will not result in any action by the university. Additional action must be taken by the individual such as reporting to their supervisor, the Local Designated Official (LDO), investigative offices listed in Appendix A or reporting to the University-wide Whistleblower Hotline (1-800-403-4744) <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/hotline> (click on appropriate UC campus).
6. Individuals who are not University employees are encouraged to file whistleblower reports directly with the LDO.
7. Whistleblowers have a responsibility to be candid and cooperative in providing information to the LDO and/or investigators assigned to a whistleblower report.
8. Protection of a whistleblower's identity will be maintained to the extent possible within the legitimate needs of law and the investigation. During a whistleblower investigation, it is also the

intent of the University to keep confidential, to the extent possible, other details of whistleblower reports, including the identities of any witnesses and the subject(s) of the complaint.

9. The reporting party may withdraw the report at any time. However, once the report is withdrawn, the whistleblower may not re-file the report.
10. If the report lacks sufficient detail to initiate a review or investigation, the LDO will contact the reporting party using the contact information provided by the whistleblower (if possible). The reporting party will have 10 working days from the date of contact by the LDO to provide sufficient detail on the report. Failure of the whistleblower to comply with the time limits of this procedure shall render the report closed.

B. Reporting to the LDO and Others

Reporting to the LDO

1. Each campus, Laboratory, the Office of the President and the Division of Agriculture and Natural Resources shall designate an official with primary responsibility to receive reports of allegations of suspected improper governmental activities (the LDO).
2. Managers, administrators and employees in supervisory roles who receive a report alleging suspected improper governmental activities shall ensure that the matter is promptly reported to their supervisor, an appropriate University manager and/or the LDO. Such employees are charged with exercising appropriate judgment in determining which matters can be reviewed under their authority and which matters must be referred to a higher level of management or the LDO. Consulting with supervisors, the LDO or other appropriate University management is encouraged and the exercise of judgment should err on the side of upward reporting. Oral reports should normally be documented by the supervisor by a written transcription of the oral report, and internal communications regarding allegations of improper governmental activities should normally be in writing.
3. Managers, administrators and employees in supervisory roles shall report to the LDO any allegations of suspected improper governmental activities, whether received as a protected disclosure, reported by their subordinates in the ordinary course of performing their duties, or discovered in the course of performing their own duties, when any of the following conditions are met:
 - The matter is the result of a significant internal control or policy deficiency that is likely to exist at other units within the institution or across the University system;
 - The matter is likely to receive media or other public attention;
 - The matter involves the misuse of University resources or creates exposure to a liability in potentially significant amounts;
 - The matter involves allegations or events that have a significant possibility of being the result of a criminal act (e.g., disappearance of cash);
 - The matter involves a significant threat to the health and safety of employees and/or the public; or
 - The matter is judged to be significant or sensitive for other reasons.

Reporting to the Office of the President and Others

1. The LDO shall have principal responsibility for meeting the reporting requirements to the Office of the President and local senior management. The LDO shall consult with members of the Investigations Workgroup as necessary in fulfilling this reporting responsibility and will, at the LDO's discretion, inform the I-Group of all reports made. The LDO (or a member of the Investigations Workgroup if the LDO has or is perceived to have a potential conflict of interest) shall make a written report to the Systemwide LDO with a copy to the Director of Investigations (DOI) and the Senior Vice President/Chief Compliance and Audit Officer of the Regents (SVP-CCAO) at the Office of the President of any reported allegations of suspected improper activities when any of the following conditions are met:
 - The matter is the result of a significant internal control or policy deficiency that is likely to exist at other units within the institution or across the University system;
 - The matter is likely to receive media or other public attention;
 - The matter involves the misuse of University resources or creates exposure to a liability of at least \$25,000;
 - The matter involves a significant threat to the health and safety of employees and/or the public; or
 - The matter alleges an improper activity by the Chancellor or Laboratory Director, the LDO, or the local Internal Audit Director; or
 - The matter is judged to be significant or sensitive for other reasons
2. A copy of communications sent to the Systemwide LDO shall be sent to the respective UC Police Department if on the basis of the allegations it appears that a crime may have been committed. The UC Police shall be consulted to determine the appropriate action with regard to these investigations. In some instances, even an allegation of improper governmental activity may be reportable to a funding entity or regulatory agency. More typically, at least preliminary investigation results are needed to assess reporting obligations to parties outside the University. The LDO, in consultation with the leadership of the affected area, will determine the nature and timing of such communications. Systemwide LDO shall be notified of any matter being reported to external agencies (other than matters routinely reported to the DOE pursuant to the Laboratory contracts).
3. Allegations of suspected losses of money, securities or other property shall be reported to the local risk management office as soon as discovered. The Chief Risk Officer, Office of the President shall be notified of such matters when they meet the criteria for reporting to the Systemwide LDO by copy of such notification. The Chief Risk Officer shall report such matters in accordance with the terms of any contracts with insurance or bonding companies.
4. When an alleged Improper Governmental Activity involves the Chancellor, the Executive Vice Chancellor, or the LDO, such reports should be made to the UCOP and Systemwide LDO, the UCOP Director of Investigations (DOI), and the Chief Compliance and Audit Officer at UCOP.
5. In the event that any person with a reporting obligation under this policy believes that there is a conflict of interest on the part of the person to whom the allegations of suspected improper activities are to be reported, the next higher level of authority shall receive the report.
6. Whistleblowers frequently make their reports in confidence. To the extent possible within the limitations of law and policy and the need to conduct a competent investigation, confidentiality

of whistleblowers will be maintained. Whistleblowers should be cautioned that their identity may become known for reasons outside of the control of the investigators or University administrators. Similarly, the identity of the subject(s) of the investigation will be maintained in confidence with the same limitations.

C. Responsibilities of the LDO and I-Group in Response to a Whistleblower Report

1. The LDO shall review the whistleblower report at the time it is received to determine whether the seriousness of the allegations makes it advisable to convene an ad hoc meeting of either the I-Group or of appropriate members of the I-Group for advice, or other jurisdictional experts on campus.
2. The LDO can act without consulting the I-Group if in his or her judgment there is a threat of immediate and serious harm to the University community. In those cases and if appropriate, the LDO may notify the I-Group of the actions taken and/or may convene the I-Group for advice on the planned course of action.
3. To determine whether an adequate basis exists for commencing an investigation, the LDO can consult with the I-Group to determine whether any reported allegations, if true, would constitute an improper governmental activity, and whether the report contains information specific enough to be investigated, or has or directly point to corroborating evidence that can be pursued. If so, the LDO can request advice from the I-Group on the procedure for the investigation.
4. If in the judgment of the LDO, the allegations do not constitute an improper governmental activity, or the report does not contain information specific enough to be investigated, or does not have or directly point to corroborating evidence that can be pursued, there will not be an investigation. In this case, the LDO should notify the whistleblower of its determination, and in situations where there was insufficient evidence to warrant an investigation, inform the individual that he or she may provide additional relevant information to the LDO for consideration.

D. Investigating Alleged Improper Governmental Activities

1. Those units authorized to investigate allegations of improper governmental activities are responsible for:
 - carrying out the investigation activities in accordance with appropriate laws, protections provided by the U.S. Constitution, and University procedures;
 - conducting the investigation fairly, objectively, thoroughly, and ethically;
 - coordinating with other investigative units working on related allegations; and
 - submitting monthly (or more frequently if necessary) status reports to the LDO.
2. The LDO will bring a summary of all investigative unit status reports to the monthly I-Group meeting.
3. University employees who are asked to provide information or to otherwise participate in a whistleblower investigation are expected to cooperate fully with University-authorized investigators as part of the terms of their employment. The University is prohibited from retaliating against any employee who has been asked to participate or who participates in an investigation.

4. University employees who are aware of a whistleblower complaint or investigation, either ongoing or completed, are expected to keep such information confidential. They may discuss the complaint or investigation only when asked to do so as part of the official campus investigation of that case.
5. Consistent with applicable personnel policies or collective bargaining agreements, an employee may be placed on administrative or investigatory leave, when the LDO determines that such a leave would serve the best interests of the employee, the University, or both. Such a leave is not to be interpreted as a disciplinary action.
6. Whistleblowers wanting information about the status or conduct of an investigation must contact the LDO for information. (See also, Section IX of these procedures.)

E. Investigation Subjects

1. A subject is a person who is the focus of investigative fact finding either by virtue of an allegation made or evidence gathered during the course of an investigation. The decision to conduct an investigation is not an accusation; it is to be treated as a neutral fact finding process. The outcome of the investigation may or may not support a conclusion that an improper governmental act was committed and, if so, by whom.
2. The identity of a subject should be maintained in confidence to the extent possible given the legitimate needs of law and the investigation.
3. Subjects should normally be informed of the allegations at the outset of a formal investigation and have opportunities for input during the investigation.
4. Subjects have a duty to cooperate with investigators to the extent that their cooperation will not compromise self-incrimination protections under state or federal law.
5. Subjects have a right to consult with a person or persons of their choice. This may involve representation, including legal representation.
6. Subjects may consult with the Office of the General Counsel (including campus counsel) concerning the investigation. The Office of the General Counsel will provide legal advice to the subject regarding issues in the investigation, unless the Office of the General Counsel determines that a divergence of interest prevents it from doing so, it being understood that at all times the Office of the General Counsel represents the interests of the University. If legal services are provided by the Office of the General Counsel to the subject, the attorney-client privilege may not be invoked by the subject to prevent disclosure to the University of information obtained by the attorney providing the services, and the subject will be advised whenever it appears that a divergence of interest may require the attorney to withdraw from providing such legal services to the subject.

Subjects are free at any time to retain their own counsel to represent them with regard to the investigation and may request that the University pay or reimburse the attorney's fees. Requests for reimbursement should be directed to the LDO. Such requests shall be considered consistent with statutory law, case law and University practice, but this policy creates no entitlement to such payments or reimbursements.

7. Subjects have a responsibility not to interfere with the investigation and to adhere to admonitions from investigators in this regard. Evidence shall not be withheld, destroyed or tampered with, and witnesses shall not be influenced, coached or intimidated.
8. Unless there are compelling reasons to the contrary, subjects should be given the opportunity to respond to material points of evidence contained in an investigation report.
9. No allegation of wrongdoing against a subject shall be considered sustained unless at a minimum, a preponderance of the evidence supports the allegation.
10. Subjects have a right to be informed of the outcome of the investigation. If allegations are not sustained, the subject should be consulted as to whether public disclosure of the investigation results would be in the best interest of the University and the subject.
11. Any disciplinary or corrective action initiated against the subject as a result of an investigation pursuant to this policy shall adhere to the applicable academic personnel or staff conduct and disciplinary procedures.

F. Substantiated Allegations

1. If allegations made in a whistleblower report are found by the investigating unit to be substantiated by the investigation, the investigator should issue a written report to the LDO. The LDO will submit a copy of the report to the principal officer of the unit in which the improper government activity occurred or is occurring. In addition, the LDO will send a report to the following offices if the specified conditions are met:
 - If criminal acts are uncovered, a confidential written report must be made to UCSC Chief of Police.
 - If monetary or materiel losses are confirmed, the Campus Risk Manager must be informed in writing.
 - If employee misconduct is confirmed, a confidential written report must be provided to the following: for non-academic appointees, to the Assistant Vice Chancellor, Staff Human Resources; for academic appointees, to the Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor; and for any campus volunteer, to University Relations.
2. If the allegations are substantiated, the department head and/or principal officer shall initiate the corrective action or disciplinary process appropriate to the investigation subject's title (e.g., for an academic Senate member, any charge of misconduct brought as a result of a whistleblower investigation shall comply with the disciplinary process for Senate members in accordance with CAPM 002.015).
3. The LDO will coordinate with the Public Affairs Office if an investigative report is anticipated to become public information.
4. If there are related allegations being investigated, the LDO will consult with the Investigations Workgroup regarding coordination of those related investigations.

G. Unsubstantiated Allegations

1. If the investigator finds a whistleblower report to be unsubstantiated, then the investigator must notify both the LDO and the principal officer of the unit being investigated of this outcome. That notification must be done within five days of closing an investigation.
2. If there are related allegations being investigated, the LDO may consult with the Investigations Workgroup regarding coordination of the related campus investigations.
3. Subjects have a right to be informed of the outcome of the investigation. If allegations are not sustained, the subject should be consulted as to whether public disclosure of the investigation results would be in the best interest of the University and the subject.

VIII. RECORDS

The investigating unit is the Office of Record and must keep a record of the investigation within their office for a specified length of time. That length of time is either that specified by University Record Retention policy (seven years for federally-funded operations and five years for all other operations), or as required by the policy of the investigating unit, whichever is greater.

IX. RESPONSE TO WHISTLEBLOWER

- A. Whistleblowers have a right to be informed of the disposition of their report absent overriding legal or public interest reasons, and may obtain information on the status of their complaint and the estimated date of completion of an investigation by contacting the LDO. When in doubt about the identity of the whistleblower, the LDO will request proper identification.
- B. Whistleblowers may request a copy of the final investigative report or reports by submitting a written request to the Information Practices Coordinator, Chancellor's Office, UC Santa Cruz, 1156 High Street, Santa Cruz, CA 95064. However, information may be released only if it does not violate University policies or federal or state laws (e.g., privacy laws).

APPENDIX A

Unless otherwise indicated, the mailing address for all offices listed below is:
 UC Santa Cruz; 1156 High Street; Santa Cruz, CA 95064.

Type of Concern/Allegation	Investigative Unit Head	Contact Information
Any whistleblower report and questions about this procedure; or complaints by persons who are not employed by the University	UCSC Locally Designated Official (LDO) for Whistleblower Matters	831-459-2058 http://whistleblower.ucsc.edu/ Mail stop: Chancellor’s Office
Misconduct by non-senate academic appointees (including misconduct by academic student employees)	Assistant Vice Chancellor, Academic Personnel Office	831-459-4300 http://apo.ucsc.edu/ Mail stop: Academic Personnel Office
Misconduct by an Academic Senate member	Campus Provost/Executive Vice Chancellor, for the Committee on Charges	831-459-2058 Mail stop: Chancellor’s Office
Discrimination, harassment, or retaliation in hiring or employment	Assistant Director for Equal Employment Opportunity	831- 459-3676 http://diversity.ucsc.edu/ Mail stop: EEO/Affirmative Action
Building code violations	Campus Architect, Physical Planning and Construction	831- 459-2973, Emergencies call 911 http://ppc.ucsc.edu/ Mail stop: Physical Planning & Construction
Misuse of hazardous materials or biologicals; or violations of health, safety, or environmental protection law or regulations	Director, Environmental Health and Safety	831- 459-5394, Emergencies call: 911 http://ehs.ucsc.edu/ Mail stop: Environmental Health & Safety
Fire code violations	Fire Chief	831-459-3473, Emergencies call: 911 http://fire.ucsc.edu/ Mail stop: Fire Department
Misuse of university resources, fraud, financial irregularities, or significant internal controls weaknesses	Director, Office of Internal Audit and Advisory Services	831-459-2241 http://audit.ucsc.edu/ Mail stop: Internal Audit
Conflict of interest reports	Coordinated by Conflict of Interest Coordinator	831-459-3210 http://www.ucop.edu/ogc/coi/econinterest.html Mail stop: Chancellor’s Office
Grievances or other staff employee misconduct issues; or misconduct in employment, hiring, and classification	Assistant Vice Chancellor, Staff Human Resources	831-459-2960 http://shr.ucsc.edu/ Mail stop: Staff Human Resources

UC Santa Cruz Whistleblower Policies and Procedures

Type of Concern/Allegation	Investigative Unit Head	Contact Information
Criminal activities, theft of university property or assets	University Police Department	831-459-2231, Emergencies: 911 http://www2.ucsc.edu/police/ Police Department Anonymous Tip Line: 831-459-3847 Mail stop: University Police
Sexual harassment or discrimination based upon sex	Title IX Coordinator / Sexual Harassment Officer	831- 459-2462 http://www2.ucsc.edu/title9-sh/ Mail stop: Chancellor’s Office
Student misconduct (not related to employment)	Director, Student Judicial Affairs	831-459-1738 http://deanofstudents.ucsc.edu/student-conduct/ Mail stop: Student Affairs
Scientific misconduct, research conflicts of interest, or technology transfer misconduct	Vice Chancellor of Research	831-459-2425 http://research.ucsc.edu/ Mail stop: Chancellor’s Office
Misconduct at other UC campuses or labs; or concerns about the UCSC Internal Audit Office, Chancellor, or Local Designed Official	University of California Systemwide Locally Designated Official (LDO) or Director of Investigations	510-987-0479 http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/compaudit/about.html
Misconduct involving other state agencies	California Bureau of State Audits Hotline <u>or</u> State Auditor	Bureau of State Audits Hotline: 1- 800- 952-5665 http://www.bsa.ca.gov/ Address: Investigations Bureau of State Audits 555 Capitol Mall, Suite 300 Sacramento, CA 95814