

11/03/18

Formal Notice of Resignation

I am writing to inform the UC Office of the President (UCOP), the other board members, and the UC Santa Barbara student body of my inability to participate in Title IX Student Advisory Board (TIX-SAB) with the current leadership. This unfortunately leaves UCSB with no representative, as our undergraduate representative position is currently unoccupied. The reason for my inability to fill this position is explained in the following account of being retaliated against by UCOP for speaking openly to the press about UC Policy, and of witnessing UCOP staff express blatantly anti-scientific sentiments on sexual violence research.

On Tuesday October 9th, 2018 and Wednesday October 10th, 2018, I presented at the Graduate Student Association (GSA) General Assembly meeting and Associated Students (AS) Senate meeting on proposed changes to the system wide Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment (SVSH) Policy currently under formal review. During the AS Senate meeting, The Bottom Line (TBL) live-tweeted and took pictures of my slides.

At the aforementioned meetings and in a meeting with the Daily Nexus (Nexus), I offered my opinions and interpretation of proposed changes and non-changes. The Daily Nexus published an article October 11th discussing those changes and quoted me several times.¹² To the best of my understanding, the UC Office of the President (UCOP) sent the writers of the Nexus a request for a retraction on October 12th, which the Nexus denied.

Ariana Alvarez, the UCSB Title IX Coordinator, met with me October 12th to discuss the Nexus article. I explained my statements and felt everything was resolved. Alvarez informed me that the Nexus would reach out to me. To my knowledge, the Nexus did not contact me during the time period between October 12th, 2018 and October 19th, 2018.

On Monday, October 15th, UCOP emailed me requesting to discuss the Nexus article within the next 48 hours. I replied via email on the 15th, informing them politely that I did not have time given the demands I face as an Engineering PhD student. UCOP demanded I make time, which I was unable to do, as I was very busy. Representation on the TIX-SAB is a volunteer position; I felt I had the right to wait to communicate with UCOP until I had enough time to devote to the issue, especially given I provided UCOP a list of my meetings, duties, and obligations that

¹ Appendix 1

² Appendix 2 explains my interpretations of the policy, based on the statements in the article which I assume to be those UCOP takes issue with. I was never notified in writing by UCOP of the exact issues with my statements.

proved 48 hours an unreasonable timeline. I assumed we could have the discussion at the upcoming TIX-SAB meeting scheduled for Friday, October 19th at UC Irvine.

On the morning of Thursday, October 18th, Suzanne Taylor, the System Wide Title IX Coordinator, wrote to inform me that my “participation on the Student Advisory Board [was] suspended... and to not attend the in-person meeting of the Board scheduled for tomorrow [Friday October 19th].”³

Unfortunately, given the obligations I mentioned in my email, I did not see Taylor’s email until the morning of Friday October 19th, 2018 at approximately 6:15 AM, while looking in my emails for the specific location of the meeting. The sudden suspension of my position on the Board seemed to be a clear attempt to bully me into issuing the retraction UCOP could not obtain from the Nexus themselves.

I was baffled. I did not know students could be kicked off University Boards for being unable to respond emails and have thirty minute phone meetings within two days. I was then faced with an untenable situation. I felt it was likely I would not be allowed into the meeting or would be treated disrespectfully if I chose to go, and I was not overly enthusiastic about driving for 3 hours or more in each direction to that end. However, I knew there was no undergraduate representative and therefore if I, or a proxy, did not go UCSB would not be represented at the meeting. Unfortunately, given the early hour and extremely short notice, I was unable to find a proxy as neither Cierra Sorin, GSA President, nor Amanda Rodriguez, GSA VP of Committees, were able to go in my stead.

We decided then that our only option was for me to attend in spite of my being specifically uninvited, and for VP Rodriguez to reach out to Taylor informing her that GSA would be sending an official representative on behalf of UCSB graduate students. I forwarded the email I received from Taylor to the UCSB GSA Executive Board; representatives from the AS Executive Board; Ariana Alvarez, the UCSB Title IX Coordinator; Briana Conway, the UCSB CARE director; the Nexus, as the situation concerned them; and TBL, as they had indicated they planned to write a story on the topic of the formal review process for the Policy.

Upon my arrival at UCI, I entered the meeting room, found my name plate, which had been set out, and sat down. Assistant Director of Student Development and Engagement Eric Heng came and found me and asked if I would be willing to speak to him in the hallway. While outside, he informed me that they had asked me not to come and that my participation had been put “on a pause.” I informed him that I had not become aware of this until that morning. He informed me that he thought I had known the night before because I had been emailing other folks on campus about it. I informed him that I had emailed the other students at approximately 6:30 AM this morning and that I would be happy to show him the timestamp on my email forwarding since it seemed that my truthfulness was being questioned.

³ Appendix 3

Heng informed me that, as Taylor indicated in her email, UCOP staff felt I had misrepresented the policy. I informed him there was a picture of me with a slide refuting one of the misrepresented claims in the article (the responsible employee component). He told me he was not fully clear on the policy issues but that his understanding was that it was more than that, and that I had put UCOP in an “incredibly awkward” position. Likely due to GSA’s intervention, Heng informed me that they probably were not going to ask me to leave, but that UCOP didn’t want me to participate in any further Board activities until I had the conversation they demanded earlier in the week. He went inside to discuss the situation with Taylor and asked me to sit in the hallway. After a few minutes he came back out and informed me I was going to be allowed to participate, but that I needed to talk to UCOP staff at 4 PM, the meeting’s end. I agreed, hoping that the meeting would proceed uneventfully from that point forward.

I entered the meeting and the group was working on drafting a mission statement. We broke up into small groups to discuss. A student from another group informed me that their table had received a lecture on the importance of representing UCOP accurately to student newspapers, which I felt was intended as a jab at me.

After lunch, an item not clearly notated on the agenda I was sent,⁴ was added to discuss “expectations,” “what the students should expect of each other,” “what the students should expect of UCOP,” and “what UCOP should expect of the students.” It seemed fairly obvious that the intention of this added agenda item was to attempt to create a set of By-Laws for the Board which would allow UCOP to justify suspending me--which the Board previously lacked--especially as expectations such as “timely response to emails from UCOP,” “accurately representing information from UCOP,” and “informing the students of UCOP’s positions on points of policy” featured prominently in this discussion. I participated in the conversation politely to the best of my ability, despite feeling pressured to retract public statements I still stand behind. I also felt that this was an effort to personally humiliate me in the hopes of shaming me into better serving UCOP’s public relations agenda.

Finally, my personal humiliation over, the Board began discussing a survey proposed by two students related to the Title IX process. The students were hoping to create a survey for all complainants, witnesses, and respondents who have gone through the formal investigation and subsequent disciplinary processes, to understand their experiences. Title IX Principal Investigator Chris Carrubba-Katz responded that they were on board with the idea if the students were willing to write it in such a way as to “put a positive spin” on the results and emphasize the strengths of the investigative process. Carruba-Katz additionally pointed out that allowing students to fill out such a survey anonymously would result in the results being “overly negative”, in clear defiance to all norms of social science research.

⁴ Appendix 4

It was at this point that I came to a metaphorical screeching halt. For several days, UCOP had been badgering and retaliating against me for what they stated were “misrepresentations” of the policy. And yet, here they were, discussing how best to write a study such that it would yield the results they wanted to hear, rather than writing one that would be seeking the truth. Although I had been willing to tolerate their intimidating behavior, this blatant disregard for the scientific method and academic scholarship was simply not something I could accept from employees of any academic institution.

I had applied to the Board with the intention of bringing the full, honest perspectives of the UCSB graduate student body to UCOP and the rest of the system. My goal was to ensure that the students received tireless advocacy and a chance to be heard. And, as a scientist, my goal is always to gather as much data as possible--using scientifically sound methods--to understand the nature of the problems we face and to work towards their solutions. In that moment, I realized that UCOP does not care about seeking the truth, they care only about good public relations, even at the expense of intellectual rigor and honesty.

I felt that UCOP was not interacting with me, nor any of the students on the Board, in good faith. And that the problem with what I had said in my presentations was not that I misrepresented the policy, but that I exposed potential flaws in the policy and opened UCOP up to possible criticism. I was not an insubordinate liar, nor confused by the policy minutia, but I was unwilling to spout the “spin” they expected the representatives to offer. As such, it was at that point that I decided to leave the room at the next break. Before my departure, I heard UCOP’s abominable perspective on the situation at UC Santa Cruz.⁵ Students voiced concerns that the retaliation policy as written would allow respondents to hire private investigators who would be allowed, as one had been at UC Santa Cruz, to contact witnesses both at their places of employment and residence.

Although Alvarez had previously assured me that this was not the intended purpose of the added language in the retaliation policy, which I believe to be her true reading of the proposed language, Suzanne Taylor informed the Board that it, in fact, was the purpose of the added language. A student pointed out that this would make it much more difficult for students without significant means to be successful in these cases and would introduce an unfair advantage to respondents with disposable income. Taylor stated that in her opinion, the presence or lack of an attorney or private investigator had never affected the outcome of any case she had overseen at any time in her career. This is, of course, inconsistent with social science research on the topic and again made it seem as if Office of the President was not sincerely dedicated to the truth about sexual violence on campus, but rather working for good public relations.

Having at this point witnessed more than I could tolerate, I decided my best course of action would be to slip out. I did not inform UCOP staff I was leaving, nor did I reach out to them about

⁵ Appendix 5 offers links for further information on the situation at UC Santa Cruz

having a possible conversation later, as I did not and do not feel at this point that it will be productive. I felt intimidated and disgusted.

UCOP has since reached out to me one time, on October 31st, to once again attempt to intimidate me into retracting my previous statement. At such time, they sent me a vaguely threatening email stating “ [we are] reaching out one final time to offer an opportunity for us to discuss the status of your membership on the SAB and the issues outlined by Suzanne in her October 18th email below. Please contact us immediately, so that we can schedule a time before **Wednesday, November 7th** to discuss these important issues.”⁶ I have no understanding what happens on Wednesday November 7th, but I am concerned that I will be further retaliated against on that date due to my continued unwillingness to retract statements I do not believe to be false. Further, the free speech implications of this situation, which until recently I felt was finished, continue to be of great concern. UCOP continues to attempt to use my position on the Board as leverage over me when I have, through my lack of response, accepted that my position as posed is terminated rather than make statements I neither agree with nor believe. The University is well within its rights to publish its own response piece if it so chooses, but it cannot and should not attempt to force dissenting students to promote its own “positive spin” through ultimatums and threats.

I am at present unsure how to proceed. I am not willing to lie to the press for UCOP, but I am fearful of further retaliation from that office. I cannot inform students that I believe UCOP has the best interests off all students at heart when UCOP staff disregards the fact that economic disparity affects sexual violence cases. I cannot say in good faith that the Office of the President is interested in hearing student voices, when the UC Title IX Principal Investigator openly expresses their hopes for a study pre-designed to yield positive results. Furthermore, UCOP has a documented history of changing survey results to paint a more favorable picture, as was found by one of the California State Audits last year.⁷ This previously documented high level deception further augments the concerns of academic honesty surrounding this situation.

This behavior in aggregate and separately casts serious doubts on the integrity and professionalism of several members of the staff working in the Office of the President Title IX Office and the Office of the President Department of Student Affairs.

It is now my belief that this committee serves no purpose other than to soothe public pressures and stave off student activism. In good conscience I cannot continue to serve on such a committee without significant structural reforms. I believe that Suzanne Taylor and Chris Carrubba-Katz ought to resign for their lack of respect for academic scholarship and I would hope to see the system wide Title IX Office to be filled with people with significant social science credentials and a proven academic record. I believe the Board will not be effective unless it is given a chance to address the Regents, preferably twice per year, on issues of sexual violence

⁶ Appendix 6

⁷ <http://www.latimes.com/local/lanow/la-me-uc-audit-interference-20171122-story.html>

on our campuses. Further, I believe a public inquiry into the situations under which student representatives may be dismissed from system wide committees must be done such that students on all committees have the ability to speak freely without fear of retaliation. I hope that additionally, as a part of re-emphasizing the importance of free speech, the Office of the President will offer a formal apology to the Student Representatives of the TIX-SAB for their unprofessional behavior surrounding this situation. I would finally ask that the UC works with student leaders in good faith on the content of the SVSH policy such that we, as students, feel it is fair. Student Representatives to the Board currently are unfortunately not in a position to do so for justified fear of retaliation. It is my distinct hope that student groups from across UCSB and the system are able to work together to determine a way to re-establish trust with the Office of the President, and that UCOP will be amenable to those changes. I hope to feel able to serve again on this Board at some point in the future, but without significant reform, I cannot in good conscience continue to do so presently.

Sincerely,

Jennifer Grace Selvidge
UC Santa Barbara
Materials Department
PhD Student
GSA VP of Student Affairs

Appendix 1: Daily Nexus Article

Title IX Policy Changes Explained By Student Advisory Board Representative

October 11, 2018 at 12:15 am by Aaron Berkness

New University of California Title IX policy changes will include amending the definition of consent and modifying the mandated reporting rules for graduate students among other changes, according to Jennifer Selvidge, graduate student representative for the Title IX Advisory Board.

The Title IX Student Advisory Board consists of one undergraduate and one graduate student from each UC campus, making a total of 19 board members. Riley Esguerra / Daily Nexus

Selvidge, a fourth-year graduate student, presented at the Graduate Student Association (GSA) meeting Tuesday evening and at Associated Students (A.S.) Senate on Wednesday, highlighting the specific changes and non-changes to the policy.

The UC-wide sexual violence and sexual harassment policy is currently in a formal review period.

The policy previously stated that all graduate students were mandatory reporters of any sexual harassment or violence. Now, graduate students are only mandatory reporters when “we’re in our capacity as an employee,” Selvidge said.

“We are not particularly well trained in this,” she said. “We have sort of a one-hour... online training that covers explanations of all of sexual violence, all of sexual harassment, stalking, dating and domestic violence ... It’s really not enough to have us understand how to respond sensitively.”

Selvidge emphasized that all other student employees who are paid by the university remain “responsible employees,” meaning they are required to report to the Title IX office in the event that they become aware of sexual violence or harassment committed against another student while they are acting as employees.

Selvidge also discussed changes to the definition of consent. The committee now defines consent as “unable to understand the...nature of sexual activity due to...alcohol and drugs.”

The policy’s change says the student would need to be incapacitated for consent to be questioned, according to Selvidge.

Additionally, the formal investigation time period has been increased from sixty calendar days to

ninety business days.

She explained the change stemmed from the university, stating they have struggled with finding enough time to complete investigations within the sixty 60 calendar day time restraint limit in the past.

The student's decision of whether or not they want a formal investigation is now not a determining factor of whether they actually get a formal investigation, according to Selvidge.

"The university will investigate things without people's consent," Selvidge said.

Another aspect of the Title IX policy that Selvidge outlined in her presentation was in regards to the sexual assault of minors.

UCSB does not consider statutory rape to be sexual assault, according to Selvidge. She pointed out that the university is trying to keep in mind 17-year-olds and their dating life.

However, several graduate students at the GSA meeting expressed their concern for their own children living on campus. It worried them that the university does not see the possible rape of their children as sexual assault, according to Selvidge.

Selvidge also discussed the new revision to the definition of sexual assault penetration and contact, which now includes language that is more inclusive toward the LGBTQ+ community, as well as male victims.

"I am actually very happy with this particular change. This is something that I worked on convincing them for several years," Selvidge said.

Power imbalances, such as the dynamic between a teacher assistant and a student, are now taken into consideration as aggravating circumstances in the new policy, according to Selvidge.

Relationship violence has also been expanded to include non-physical conduct such as the abuse of a pet or the destruction of property.

The Title IX Student Advisory Board consists of one undergraduate and one graduate student from each UC campus, making a total of 19 board members.

Currently, the undergraduate position for UCSB is vacant. Students who are interested should contact Ariana Alvarez, the Title IX Officer for UCSB.

Appendix 2: My policy Interpretations

There was, admittedly, some confusion between myself and the reporter. I tried to be clear in all three cases that responsible employee obligations for all students were to remain the same, specifically that we are mandated to report to the Title IX office when we become aware of sexual violence or sexual harassment committed against another student while acting in our capacity as an employee, which has not changed. I am unclear how confusion arose on this point.

The next item of contention however surrounds changes to the definition of consent. Consent is defined in the policy at its highest level as “affirmative, conscious, voluntary, and revocable.” Following this broad overview statement it is noted that the respondent’s belief that the complainant consented will not provide a valid defense unless that belief is actual and reasonable. It then follows with several specific situations in which the respondent’s belief that the complainant consented will never be a valid defense by reason of that belief never being actual or reasonable. The interpretation of the definition can therefore be assumed to correspond most closely to the content of that section. This is because in numerous cases where one of those grounds has NOT been met, it is relatively likely that the respondent would be found not responsible by reason of their lack of understanding that the complainant did not consent. Amongst the specific outlined reasons reads the statement:

The Respondent knew or a reasonable person should have known that the Complainant was unable to consent because the Complainant was incapacitated, in that the Complainant was:

- a. asleep or unconscious;
- b. unable to understand the fact, nature, or extent of the sexual activity due to the influence of drugs, alcohol, or medication; or
- c. unable to communicate due to a mental or physical condition.

Note: Incapacitation is a state beyond drunkenness or intoxication. A person is not necessarily incapacitated merely as a result of drinking, using drugs, or taking medication.

Before the introduction of the note, many students, myself included, had assumed that that subsection B referred to simple intoxication. The addition of this note has clarified that “sober” is no longer required for a complainant’s consent, as a student may be drunk or high and another student may argue that they did not understand the other student did not consent, and this may provide a valid defense in that case if the investigation determines the complainant was not “incapacitated.” Further, in many past meetings with UCOP they have indicated that they do not wish to outline specific examples in other areas of the policy as they assume those examples will be read as being the only situations in which a certain policy applies. That they have chosen to do so here, in spite of their stated concern about examples, leads me to believe that this is indeed the intended interpretation. However, I have since been informed that subsection B never implied simple intoxication, and as such, consent was never required to be sober. This was my mistake, however, I do not feel that is necessarily an improvement.

The third statement, which I have made which I feel I must defend is “the university will investigate things without people’s consent.” This is however easily confirmed by the following excerpt from the SVSH Policy:

If the Complainant requests that no Formal Investigation occur, the Title IX Officer will seriously consider the Complainant’s request, but must determine whether the allegations nonetheless require an investigation to mitigate a potential risk to the campus community. If the Title IX Officer decides to proceed with a Formal Investigation despite the Complainant’s request, the Title IX Officer will provide the Complainant with all notifications and information required by this Policy.

This quotation clearly specifies that the university, in certain circumstances, will investigate allegations without the consent of the complainant.

The final point on which I find myself questioned is my contention that statutory rape is not considered sexual assault under the SVSH Policy. It is my understanding that the age of consent in the state of California is 18, meaning all “Sexual intercourse with a person under the age of 18” would be considered statutory rape. This quote was taken from the subsection “Other Prohibited Behavior” and not “Sexual Assault” quite clearly, in my mind, defining it as something other than sexual assault. This is not to say it is not prohibited by the policy, it is just to say that it is not considered to be “Sexual Assault” as specifically defined by this policy.

As such, on the responsible employee component, I am unable to comment on where the breakdown in communication happened. Should you require confirmation on this, please ask Marisela Marquez who was present for my presentation to AS. As for the rest, these were and are my interpretations of the SVSH Policy, and unless I am given compelling evidence to contradict these stances, such as data on these types of cases, they remain my understanding of the policy. None were intentionally inaccurate, and indeed, they are grounded in the language of the policy itself.

Appendix 3:

Dear Jenny,

I write to inform you that your participation on the Student Advisory Board is on pause as of today. As you know, your campus newspaper reported last week on information you purportedly shared in meetings with the Graduate Student Association and Associated Students Senate. The article attributed several grossly inaccurate statements to you that harmfully misrepresent proposed revisions to UC's Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment Policy.

On October 12, 2017, the day after the article was published online, OP's Director of Media Relations contacted the paper's editors to notify them of the inaccuracies and request that they issue a correction or take the article down; they refused to do so on the basis that they had accurately reported your statements. They indicated they had audio recordings of your statements to support their reporting. That day, your campus Title IX Officer, Ariana Alvarez, asked that you personally contact the newspaper to correct the inaccuracies. You indicated to her that you were too busy to do so. On Monday, October 15, Evelyn Cheng in my office emailed you and requested that you speak to me by phone about the article; you again indicated you were too busy. You did not respond to her last email.

People on your campus and across the system work daily to encourage reporting and engender confidence in the SVSH Policy and Title IX process. The misstatements reported in this article seriously undermine these efforts. Your unwillingness to correct the article is contrary to the purpose of the Student Advisory Board, and of great concern.

Until you address this issue, your participation on the Student Advisory Board is suspended. Please do not attend the in-person meeting of the Board scheduled for tomorrow. I made this decision in consultation with the OP's Office of Student Affairs. I welcome a conversation with you to address this issue. If you would like to continue with the Student Advisory Board, please contact me, Evelyn, or Eric to schedule a call.

Sincerely,
Suzanne

Suzanne Taylor
Interim UC Systemwide Title IX Coordinator
510-987-9161

From: Evelyn Cheng
Sent: Monday, October 15, 2018 2:46 PM
To: Jenny Selvidge <selvidge@ucsb.edu>
Subject: RE: Call with Suzanne and Eric

Hi Jenny,

I think it's important to have this conversation since the article is published. Let me know if there is a 30 min block you are available to be on the call.

Thanks,
Evelyn

From: Jenny Selvidge <selvidge@ucsb.edu>
Sent: Monday, October 15, 2018 2:43 PM
To: Evelyn Cheng <Evelyn.Cheng@ucop.edu>
Subject: Re: Call with Suzanne and Eric

Not overly available... how much time are we expecting this to take? I am the GSA VP of student affairs so I have a three hour meeting for UCSHIP tomorrow, the rest of a four hour meeting for UCSHIP today, a meeting with my advisor tomorrow, a meeting with Intel who sponsors my research Wednesday, a meeting with my research group later today, during my current UCSHIP meeting, a meeting with Carol Genetti the dean of the graduate school Thursday, and another research group meeting for my second advisor's research group Thursday all before I need to drive to Irvine Friday... I can try to squeeze you all in, but realistically, I have no time to go fact check the Nexus this week especially since no one reads it anyways.

On Mon, Oct 15, 2018 at 2:34 PM Evelyn Cheng <Evelyn.Cheng@ucop.edu> wrote:

Hi Jenny,

Suzanne and Eric would like to schedule a call with you to discuss the Daily Nexus article. Are you available tomorrow or Wednesday? Let me know if there are some preferred times and I will try to work around those.

Thanks,
Evelyn

Evelyn Cheng
Systemwide Title IX Program Coordinator
Systemwide Title IX Office
University of California | Office of the President
Evelyn.Cheng@ucop.edu | 510-987-0918

<http://sexualviolence.universityofcalifornia.edu/>

Appendix 4:

Agenda

10:00 – 10:15 AM	Welcome Introductions Overview of Day
10:15 – 11:45 AM	Mission and Structure of the SAB
11:45 – 12:00 PM	Trip to DC – Claire and Sophie
12:00 – 12:45 PM	Lunch
12:45 – 1:00 PM	Meditation - Leann
1:00 – 1:45 PM	Timely Topics <ul style="list-style-type: none">· Proposed Title IX Survey· SVSH Policy – Retaliation· Climate Survey Update
1:45 – 2:45 PM	SAB Recommendations
2:45 – 3:30 PM	Small group discussion on SAB Recommendations
3:30 – 3:50 PM	Large group discussion on SAB Recommendations
3:50 – 4:00 PM	Future meetings & Wrap-Up

Appendix 5:

<https://www.buzzfeednews.com/article/nidhisubbaraman/gopal-balakrishnan-violated-harassment-policy>

<https://www.mercurynews.com/2018/09/28/ucsc-alum-tells-story-behind-investigation-into-professors-conduct/>

<https://www.chronicle.com/article/Professor-at-UC-Santa-Cruz/241964>

Appendix 6:

Jenny,

I am writing to follow-up on our conversation at the October 19th Student Advisory Board (SAB) meeting at UC Irvine. Because of the serious concerns outlined in Suzanne's email below, she instructed you not to attend the meeting and that your membership on the SAB is on pause. In spite of this instruction, you elected to attend the meeting. I spoke with you upon your arrival and Suzanne and I agreed to allow you to participate in the SAB meeting with the understanding that we would all huddle at the end of the day to discuss our concerns. You agreed that meeting at the end of the day was a fair offer. Ultimately you left the meeting half way through, before we could meet, and neither Suzanne or I have heard from you since.

Without any communication from you, we can only assume that you are no longer interested in serving on the SAB or adhering to the SAB expectations discussed at the October 19th meeting while you were present. Further, we understand from an editor of the Daily Nexus that they have attempted unsuccessfully to contact you regarding the misstatements in the article. Your failure to respond, or otherwise address this situation, has allowed this erroneous and harmful article to stand, and placed responsibility for correcting the misstatements on Suzanne and Ariana, your campus Title IX officer. I am reaching out one final time to offer an opportunity for us to discuss the status of your membership on the SAB and the issues outlined by Suzanne in her October 18th email below.

Please contact us immediately, so that we can schedule a time before **Wednesday, November 7th** to discuss these important issues.

Best,
Eric

Eric Heng

Assistant Director, Student Development and Engagement
University of California, Office of the President
Gender Pronouns: He/Him/His