February 21, 2024

James A. Steintrager, Chair, Academic Council
1111 Franklin Street, 12th Floor
Oakland, CA 94607-5200

RE: Systemwide Review: Revisions to Presidential Policy BFB-BUS-46 (Use of University Vehicles)

Dear Jim,

The Riverside Executive Council discussed the subject proposed policy revisions during their February 12, 2024 meeting. Members, similar to the comments of responding committees, highlighted concerns about privacy issues, potential data breaches, and lack of clarity around the application of the policy to personal vehicles used to get to research areas (e.g., field work).

While some local standing committees had no comments on the revisions, others, as detailed in the attached had significant concerns including that the policy is too broad and restrictive. There are questions and concerns regarding the necessity of the policy as written, implementation going “too far,” as well as questions about the potential of bias and racism in the determination of driving offenses for drivers under this policy. Finally, another committee pointed out the potential for strain on staff time in executing the policy.

I encourage a full reading of the comments and the links provided herewith.

Sincerely yours,

Sang-Hee Lee
Professor of Anthropology and Chair of the Riverside Division

CC: Monica Lin, Executive Director of the Academic Senate
Cherysa Cortez, Executive Director of UCR Academic Senate Office
February 01, 2024

TO: Sang-Hee Lee, Chair  
Riverside Division of the Academic Senate

FROM: Wesley Leonard, Chair  
CHASS Executive Committee

RE: Systemwide Review of Proposed Presidential Policy BFB-BUS-46 Use of University Vehicles

The CHASS Executive Committee (EC) at the University of California at Riverside has reviewed the proposed revisions to Presidential Policy BFB-BUS-46 Use of University Vehicles and would like to provide the following comments:

1. CHASS EC members expressed serious concerns regarding the established links between driving violations and discriminatory racial profiling practices. Research has shown that Black people, especially, have been and continue to be disproportionately targeted for routine traffic stops (see, e.g., https://sc.edu/uofsc/posts/2020/06/racial_disparities_traffic_stops.php). This raises questions about the potential of bias and racism in the determination of driving offenses for University drivers that fall under this policy.

   We advocate the adoption of the California DMV point system, where a letter of warning is sent out for the accumulation of 2 points within 12 months, 4 points within 24 months, and 6 points within 36 months; a notice of intent to suspend the license if a person receive 3 points within 12 months, 5 points within 24 months, and 7 points within 36 months; and suspension of ability to use vehicles and driver authorization for University business when a person receives 4 points within 12 months, 6 points within 24 months, and 8 points within 36 months. See: https://www.dmv.ca.gov/portal/driver-education-and-safety/dmv-safety-guidelines-actions/negligence/negligent-operator-actions/ for reference (last accessed 1/22/2024).

2. Re: “The BUS 46 Policy applies to the use of any UC vehicle (owned or leased) and personal vehicles used in the course of University business”
CHASS EC members raised questions about types of vehicles, and where they can be driven, that are covered by this policy. For example, does the BUS 46 Policy also apply to electric vehicles used on campus sidewalks, roads, and pathways for University purposes, such as golf carts and e-assist bicycles, among others? Research has shown that golf carts, in particular, have been involved in a high number of campus accidents: https://www.ue.org/risk-management/transportation-safety/golf-carts-on-campus/

To address these questions, we suggest inclusion and explicit mention of which vehicles are covered under this policy and a clear definition of what constitutes “highway,” as well as inclusion within the text of any additional UC or UCR-specific policies that cover non-highway driven vehicles and where they are able to be used.

3. Aligning with “Sustainability for climate action and environmental justice” as the 5th pillar in UCR’s 2030 strategic plan, CHASS EC members believe sustainability should play a more central role in Presidential Policy BFB-BUS-46. Although the idea of supporting sustainability already exists in the current proposal, we call attention to how the associated responsibilities are framed in Section V (“Required Procedures”) only as things that may happen (e.g., “To ensure growth in ridesharing programs and use of public transit, specific incentives may be developed”). This contrasts to the other points in the same section where the actions are required (e.g., “Each Location will establish procedures to …”, “... must maintain records”).
February 1, 2024

To: Sang-Hee Lee, Chair
Riverside Division

From: Abhijit Ghosh, Chair
Committee on Faculty Welfare

RE: [Systemwide Review] Proposal: Revisions to Presidential Policy BFB-BUS-46 (Use of University Vehicles)

At our meeting on January 9, 2024, the Committee on Faculty Welfare (CFW) reviewed the proposed revisions to Presidential Policy BFB-BUS-46 (Use of University Vehicles). CFW does not see many significant changes from the previous version of this policy to address our concerns expressed in a previous review and thus retains a majority of the same concerns as those voiced by UCR’s then-CFW Chair to UCR’s then-Senate Chair in the memorandum dated October 22, 2018.

CFW believes this document is still too broadly written and overly restrictive. Particular questions about the policy that remain include:

1) What is the motivation for this policy? Why is this policy needed?
2) Does the policy apply to a faculty driving their own car to the airport or anywhere else on University business? If so, why?
3) How are the points accrued by the NOTS system used to mete out punishment? If the policy applies to the questions raised in #2 above, would the policy allow the University to suspend the faculty from driving their own car somewhere when trying to get to an academic meeting, field-related classes, etc.? Is this really the intent of the policy? Shouldn't this type of punishment be left up to the police and the DMV?

Furthermore, CFW is concerned that the title of this policy now has “University” removed, changing from “Use of University Vehicles” to “Use of Vehicles and Driver Authorization.” This substantiates our belief that the policy is overly restrictive and allows university overreach, as now the policy’s title itself suggests the University will police and infringe on the use of our personal vehicles and related driving privileges.

CFW stresses once again that it should be made clear why this policy is needed, especially considering the notably large amount of work that this would add to the plate of staff members who would inevitably have to monitor adherence to and enforcement of this policy.
GRADUATE COUNCIL

December 15, 2023

To: Sang-Hee Lee, Chair
    Riverside Division

From: David Oglesby, Chair
    Graduate Council

Re: [Systemwide Review] (Proposal) Revisions to Presidential Policy BFB-BUS-46
    (Use of University Vehicles)

Graduate Council reviewed the proposed revisions to Presidential Policy BFB-BUS-46
(Use of University Vehicles) at their December 14, 2023 meeting and had no comments
about the proposed changes.
At our meeting on January 9, 2024, the Committee on Planning and Budget (CPB) reviewed the proposed revisions to *Presidential Policy BFB-BUS-46: Use of University Vehicles*. CPB raised the following questions/concerns:

- Why is the University of California (UC) suspending the purchase of additional 15-passenger vans? Why is the UC initiating a plan to phase out existing fleets of 15-passenger vans?

- What are the proposed revisions’ implications for professors taking students to field research? How does this policy impact a professor using a university vehicle (or a personal vehicle) for doing field research with their staff/students?

- How does this policy impact a professor renting a car to drive to meet with their students?

- How does this policy apply to visits to conferences, companies, other universities, etc.?
To: Sang-Hee Lee, Division Chair of the UCR Division of the Academic Senate and Cherysa Cortez, Executive Director of the UCR Academic Senate

From: Katherine Meltzoff, Ph.D., Faculty Chair of the School of Education Executive Committee

Subject: [Systemwide Review] Proposal: Revisions to Presidential Policy BFB-BUS-46 (Use of University Vehicles)

The SOE Executive Committee reviewed the [Systemwide Review] Proposal: Revisions to Presidential Policy BFB-BUS-46 (Use of University Vehicles). Comments/feedback were solicited at our executive committee meeting and via email.

We do not have any questions or comments regarding this proposal.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback.

Sincerely,

Katherine Meltzoff
Faculty Executive Committee Chair
School of Education
University of California, Riverside
February 12, 2024

TO: Sang-Hee Lee, Ph.D., Chair, Academic Senate, UCR Division

FROM: Marcus Kaul, Ph.D., Chair, Faculty Executive Committee, UCR School of Medicine

SUBJECT: Response to [Systemwide Review] Proposal: Revisions to Presidential Policy BFB-BUS-46 (Use of University Vehicles)

Dear Sang-Hee,

The SOM Faculty Executive Committee has reviewed the proposed Revised Policy: Presidential Policy BFB-BUS-46 Use of University Vehicles and identified several points that need clarification and discussion.

The Committee identified the following challenges with the policy:

- The committee would like to bring your attention to a fact that they (Office of Risk Services (OPRS) partnered with the systemwide UC Driver Vehicle Safety Workgroup (comprised of Risk Management, Environment Health and Safety and Fleet Management staff) revised the policy to include besides the university-owned vehicle fleet also faculty private vehicles. That means that they will request a report from DMV for your driving record and if you have a red-light ticket, etc they will not allow you to use your own vehicle for business. For example, driving to attend a meeting (will not re-imburse). This will not only create extra work for staff but is a problem with the faculty privacy. Every car owner has to have their own car insurance. Therefore, private cars and driver records are not the university’s or its committee’s purview.

- Overall, members of the FEC considered any request for your DMV record as firstly inappropriate and secondly not practical.

- For occasional drivers (as policy states), which most faculty would fit, some of the requirements are unreasonable.

- Pulling a driver record from the DMV for people who don’t drive university-operated vehicles or don’t operate vehicles on behalf of the university beyond their own work-related driving seems highly problematic and inappropriate in terms of privacy, also because there is no guideline of how the records will be kept safe, confidential, and who gets to see the information.

- It’s also unclear what the required qualifications are for people on the committee(s), such as the Vehicle Collision Review Committee (VCRC).

- Another comment: Under the pretense of safety, this proposed policy seems to have taken things a bit too far. In private industry, its common practice for an employer to monitor those that have commercial licenses and whose primary role is to drive on behalf of the operation. Neither of that applies here for faculty. The proposed procedure also places an unreasonable amount of bureaucratic effort on staff and reduces the ability of faculty to perform their duties. … What will likely be the outcome if this is implemented is that faculty will be using more expensive forms of transportation, or not seek reimbursement for business travel. The university will also need to hire additional personnel to run what appears to be a shadow system of what the DMV already does (investigating collisions, evaluating driver quality, etc). Globally, this will just lead to more expense and less faculty productivity without any material impact on safety.
Yours sincerely,

[Signature]

Marcus Kaul, Ph.D.
Chair, Faculty Executive Committee School of Medicine
Dear Cherysa,

The School of Business Executive Committee has no comment on this proposal.

Elodie

On Nov 22, 2023, at 12:19 PM, Ana E Kafie <ana.kafie@ucr.edu> wrote:

FYI

Ana Kafie
Director of Academic Personnel and Human Resources

School of Business
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