



ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
February 13, 2025
Minutes of Special Meeting

I. Roll Call of Members

Pursuant to the call, the Assembly of the Academic Senate held a special meeting on Thursday, February 13, 2025. Academic Senate Chair Steven W. Cheung presided and called the meeting to order at 2:00 pm. Senate Executive Director Monica Lin called the roll of Assembly members and confirmed a quorum. Attendance is listed in Appendix A of these minutes.

II. Announcements

▪ **Steven W. Cheung, Chair**

Chair Cheung acknowledged UC Davis Professor Walter Leal, who led the petition to hold this Special Meeting. The business included discussion of three topics:

1. UC Information Security Investment Plans in Relation to Faculty Research, Teaching, and Academic Personnel Matters
2. Faculty Compensation and Cost-of-Living Adjustments
3. UC Health Plan Costs

Chair Cheung also acknowledged a petition for a special Assembly meeting to discuss a proposal regarding a UC systemwide academic calendar. Chair Cheung committed to scheduling this meeting in March 2025.

Chair Cheung asked UCOP administrative colleagues to address their respective topics within a 10-minute window, followed by Q&A and remarks from faculty kept at 2 minutes each. The meeting was conducted under procedures of the American Institute of Parliamentarians Standard Code (Sturgis 18.11). Based on parliamentary procedures for special meetings, any discussion outside of the agendized item or any proposed action would be out of order. In addition, per [Senate Bylaw 120.C.2](#), proposed new business can be taken up only at the conclusion of agendized items and only with the unanimous consent of the voting Assembly members present.

III. UC Information Security Investment Plans in Relation to Faculty Research, Teaching, and Academic Personnel Matters

- **Van Williams, Vice President and Chief Information Officer, Information Technology Services (ITS)**
- **Monte Ratzlaff, Interim Chief Information Security Officer, ITS**

Background and Context: A February 26, 2024 letter from President Drake asked chancellors to implement several new cybersecurity measures by May 28, 2025: enhanced controls, including mandatory endpoint detection and recovery (EDR) software and stronger enforcement of cybersecurity training compliance, as well as withholding merit increases for leaders of non-compliant units. In a June 6, 2024 letter from the Academic Council and a May 15, 2024 letter from the University Committee on Academic Computing and Communication (UCACC), faculty [expressed concerns](#) about these mandates.

UCOP leaders acknowledged the concerns and provided the following context and clarifications:

Cybersecurity Priority: The Board of Regents and President Drake consider cybersecurity to be the top enterprise risk for the UC system. UC faces increasing cybersecurity threats that could impact faculty research, student and employee privacy, and the University's healthcare operations. Recent security breaches have cost the University over \$100 million. UC risks losing \$4 billion in federal research funding if it fails to comply with evolving cybersecurity regulations.

EDR Software: EDR is a signature-based and behavior-based security tool that detects and prevents cybersecurity threats at the endpoint level, such as laptops, desktops, and mobile devices. It is part of UC's existing cybersecurity infrastructure for data protection. UCOP leaders clarified that EDR software does not allow administrators to access faculty files or extract data from personal or research devices, and that faculty with specialized research needs can apply for policy exceptions (e.g., cases where research devices cannot support EDR software).

Cybersecurity Training: The University's goal is to achieve 94-95% cybersecurity training compliance systemwide. UC offers 30-day grace periods around training deadlines. In addition, new UC employees have 30 days from hire to complete training, and faculty and staff who fall out of compliance have 30 days to complete training before penalties apply. Faculty on sabbatical, staff on leave, and graduate student employees are exempt from compliance training.

Unit Head Designation and Merit Increases: UCOP leaders clarified that a provision in the new policy requiring chancellor approval for merit increases of non-compliant unit heads is not intended to impact individual faculty members. The definition of "unit head" is at the discretion of each campus chancellor and no campus has formally designated faculty as unit heads under this policy. If any faculty member is categorized as a unit head, it would be a local campus decision, not a systemwide mandate.

Discussion Highlights:

- Faculty noted that the policies were implemented without proper Senate consultation, and the concerns outlined in the Academic Council and UCACC letters were never addressed in a formal response.
- Several faculty members described the EDR software as "spyware," and raised concerns about whether it tracks web browsing behavior and collects data beyond security purposes. Specific concerns included:
 1. Documentation suggesting that Trellix security software can monitor web browsing activity.
 2. The lack of clear policies on who has access to collected data, where it is stored, and how long it is retained.
 3. UC has not provided sufficient assurances to faculty handling sensitive research data, student records, and personnel data that their data is protected. Faculty requested full disclosure of EDR configurations, including what data is collected and stored.
- Faculty argued that UC-mandated security software on faculty computers and personal devices interferes with academic freedom by dictating which security tools they must use. Some questioned whether security monitoring could limit or censor research activities, particularly in fields like political science, legal studies, and journalism.
- Faculty warned that some research areas are incompatible with EDR, particularly high-performance computing environments that require minimal system interference; quantum computing; and student projects involving Internet of Things devices (e.g., Raspberry Pis, microcontrollers, oscilloscopes) that may be blocked from UC networks under the policy.

Faculty expressed concerns that the policy could result in millions of dollars in lost research funding.

- Faculty expressed concern that some campuses have not clearly defined who qualifies as a “unit head,” and that UC’s [Electronic Information Security Policy](#) (IS-3) allows campuses to shift cybersecurity compliance responsibilities onto individual faculty, making them personally liable for security incidents.
- CIO Williams reiterated that cybersecurity is a systemwide priority. He clarified that EDR software does not access private faculty files or extract data from their devices. Instead, it monitors for behavioral anomalies that might indicate a cybersecurity threat. He noted that his office collaborated with campus counterparts to conduct extensive privacy reviews of the software and to define a set of EDR standards that respects campus autonomy. He reiterated that faculty had not been formally designated as unit heads but agreed that more clarity was needed. He emphasized that UCOP does not control local implementation. Faculty members are invited to contact him with specific concerns. He noted that he has discussed the issues raised in the Senate letter with UCACC and made commitments.
- A former UCACC chair argued that the issue is not IS-3 itself but how it has been communicated and implemented at the campus level. Some campuses (e.g., UCB, UCI) have had collaborative discussions with IT leadership and developed robust privacy safeguards and exception processes. Other campuses reported top-down mandates with little room for negotiation. He offered to share UCB’s privacy policies and exception processes with other campuses.
- Faculty called for systemwide clarification about the extent of campus autonomy in implementing cybersecurity policies. They asked specifically for a publicly available policy that explains what data is collected, how long it is stored, who has access and under what conditions, as well as a stronger exception policy for faculty working with sensitive research data.
- Faculty requested a report, to be delivered within two months, detailing how UC is addressing the concerns raised in the spring 2024 Senate letters and this special Assembly meeting. Some continued to call for the immediate suspension of the directives until the concerns are resolved.
- UCOP leadership acknowledged faculty concerns and the need for greater transparency, stronger consultation, and clearer exception processes. They committed to:
 1. Respond formally to the June 6, 2024 letter.
 2. Update EDR FAQ document to clarify how EDR software works and what data is collected.
 3. Issue clearer guidance on which aspects of the security policy are systemwide mandates and which reflect local campus practices.
 4. Formally consult with UCACC on ways to improve communication and shared governance in future IT policy decisions.

IV. Faculty Compensation and Salary Range Adjustments

- **Katherine S. Newman, Provost and Executive Vice President, Academic Affairs**
- **Amy K. Lee, Deputy Provost, Systemwide Academic Personnel**
- **Douglas Haynes, Interim Vice Provost, Faculty Affairs and Academic Programs**

Faculty Compensation Structure & Adjustments: UC has distinct human resources systems for academic employees and for staff. Unlike staff, faculty salaries are based on a structured salary scale with general range adjustments applied, following a budget assessment. Faculty members also participate in a merit-based advancement system, which allows them to move up salary scale steps every 2-3 years with corresponding pay increases based on successful academic reviews. In contrast, staff employees receive across the board increases to their base salary.

Timing of Faculty Salary Adjustments: Historically, faculty received general range adjustments on October 1 and merit increases on July 1, while salary increases for other policy-covered UC employees took effect on July 1. In 2013, faculty range adjustments were temporarily moved to July 1 due to the restart of UC Retirement Plan contributions. In 2019, UC leadership decided to return to an October 1 adjustment date to allow more time for processing complex faculty salary components. To offset this implementation date change, faculty received a 5.33% increase in 2019, while staff and other academic administrators received a 3% increase. This included an additional 1.33% to account for the adjustment delay and 1% to address faculty salary gaps in relation to UC's "[Comparison 8](#)" institutions.

Complexity of Faculty Salary Adjustments: Unlike staff, faculty salaries have multiple components and funding sources, requiring considerable manual data entry. Staff salary adjustments are automated and apply to a single salary rate, while faculty require individualized processing based on scale, off-scale, above-scale, and other components. The October 1 implementation for faculty range adjustments allows Academic Personnel offices time to ensure accuracy and reduces administrative stress. Processing faculty salary increases before the state budget is finalized (in May) also increases the risk of errors.

Faculty Salary Increases Under President Drake: Since President Drake took office in 2020, the faculty salary plan has prioritized applying full increases to the faculty salary scales rather than dividing them into discretionary equity pools. Annual faculty salary increases have been 3% (2021); 4% (2022); 4.6% (2023); and 4.2% (2024). These increases have helped reduce UC's salary gap in relation to the Comparison 8 from 7.8% in 2018-19 to 3.1% in 2023-24.

Next Steps & Campus Engagement: President Drake has encouraged campus-level discussions with divisional Senates regarding off-scale and above-scale salary components. Campuses are also encouraged to implement equity adjustments for faculty where appropriate.

Chair Cheung invited questions from Assembly members and Senate faculty.

Discussion Highlights:

- An Assembly member questioned the methodology used to compare faculty and staff salary increases in 2019, arguing that the correct comparison should be 5.33% vs. 4%, not 5.33% vs. 3% because part of the increase was specifically to adjust for the timing shift from July to October. He requested access to the spreadsheets used in the analysis so faculty could verify the data. Deputy Provost Lee responded that both 3% and 4% analyses were conducted based on faculty feedback, and these materials were shared with a joint Senate-Administration workgroup convened by Provost Newman.
- An Assembly member raised concerns that an October 1 salary adjustment negatively impacts faculty who retire between July and October, as they receive their pension based on pre-adjustment salary. Deputy Provost Lee confirmed that an analysis of the retirement impacts was conducted, but it remains unclear if or how policy adjustments will be made based on those findings.
- An Assembly member argued that historical precedent is not an adequate justification for continued separation of faculty and staff salary adjustments. Another member argued that applying a cost-of-living adjustment (COLA) to the salary scale is a straightforward process that does not need to consider supplemental pay streams. Provost Newman defended the distinction, stating that the 2019 adjustment included an additional increase to ensure faculty were not disadvantaged by the October 1 shift. Deputy Provost Lee explained that faculty salaries include multiple funding sources, off-scale salary components, and above-scale salaries, all of

which must be adjusted manually and require careful coordination across different payroll structures.

- Several Assembly members voiced support for a proposal to shift senior administrator salary increases to October 1, arguing that this would demonstrate fairness, especially given faculty concerns about bloated administrative salaries. Faculty also argued that they must undergo extensive merit reviews to receive salary increases, whereas chancellors recently received large raises (e.g., 33.7% at one campus) without such reviews. In addition, faculty administrators tend to receive large salary boosts upon appointment. Provost Newman noted that salaries of senior administrators are determined by the Regents. She clarified that administrators do not go through the faculty merit process, but acknowledged faculty concerns about fairness.
- An Assembly member emphasized that while the Regents approve chancellor salaries, President Drake makes the recommendations to them. Provost Newman agreed, clarifying that final authority rests with the Regents and that President Drake had justified chancellor salary increases as necessary for recruitment and retention, and market competitiveness.
- An Assembly member requested greater transparency in sharing Comparison 8 salary data with faculty. Deputy Provost Lee stated that comparison data with the Comparison 8 is collected annually and reviewed with the Senate; however, the member emphasized that faculty outside the Senate leadership rarely see this data.
- An Assembly member noted that faculty review administrators during merit evaluations, but their career paths and compensation structures remain significantly different. The member suggested that a more equitable salary structure should be considered for all employee groups.
- An Assembly member proposed a formal motion recommending that all administrators receive salary increases on October 1, aligning them with faculty. Chair Cheung stated that the special Assembly meeting only allows for discussion of noticed items on the agenda and that a formal motion would require unanimous agreement from those voting members of the Assembly who are present to be considered as an item of new business at the end of the meeting.

V. UC Health Plan Costs

- **Cheryl Lloyd, Vice President & Systemwide Chief Human Resources Officer**
- **Jay Henderson, Associate Vice President for Total Rewards, Systemwide Human Resources**
- **Maynard Jenkins, Senior Executive Director, Benefits Programs and Strategy, Systemwide Human Resources**

Overview of Rising Healthcare Costs: Premiums for UC healthcare plans increased by 7.6% in 2025, which is in line with other large organizations (e.g., CalPERS and Federal Employees Health Benefits) and compares to a national average of 8-9%. UC's preferred provider organization (PPO) plans experienced significant inflation, although lower costs in health maintenance organization (HMO) plans helped moderate overall increases for employees in lower pay bands. Key cost drivers include increased utilization of specialty drugs, behavioral healthcare, and new fertility benefits, as well as ongoing healthcare inflation and the loss of government subsidies. In addition, the sickest 1.5–2% of plan members account for 40% of total medical spending (e.g., cancer-related costs). Despite significant premium increases (8.1% in 2024 and 6.4% in 2025), UC approved a 50% (or \$51 million) increase above its standard 4% increase for 2025 to mitigate employee premium increases. Still, UC's employer cost share declined from 86% in 2020 to 82.4% in 2025, shifting a greater cost burden onto employees. These increases were also distributed across employee pay bands to reduce the overall impact for lower-paid staff.

Strategies to Address Rising Costs: UCOP leaders are working with a consulting firm to evaluate the entire benefits portfolio, including plan designs and contribution models, to improve affordability while balancing cost sharing. UC is also exploring additional partnerships with UC Health, including the possibility of enhanced discounts through UC Health providers for employees. Senate consultation will be expanded via the systemwide Health Care Task Force (HCTF), a standing subcommittee of the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW), to ensure that faculty have a meaningful voice in future health benefits decisions.

Benefits Studies: Associate Vice President Henderson announced the kickoff of a study on faculty total remuneration to assess UC's competitiveness in compensation, benefits, and retirement compared to peer institutions that have also updated their benefits models since UC's last study in 2014. Findings from the study are expected by mid-2025 and will inform future compensation policies. A vendor for the study has been selected and four Senate faculty are serving on an advisory workgroup convened by Systemwide Human Resources. UCOP Human Resources is also planning a systemwide survey to collect feedback on benefits preferences from faculty and staff.

Discussion Highlights

- Faculty raised concerns about Anthem dropping a major provider in San Diego, affecting 125,000 patients. They called on UCOP to explore new legal measures, including contractual requirements for insurers to maintain their networks for the full contract term. Senior Executive Director Jenkins noted the complexity of insurer-provider negotiations and agreed to explore whether such disruptions could qualify as a “significant life event” allowing employees to change their health plan outside the normal open enrollment period.
- Faculty expressed concern that faculty were informed about the health plan changes only days before Open Enrollment despite past requests for earlier involvement. An Assembly member noted that the decline in UC's employer contribution has resulted in cost burden increases for faculty that harms faculty recruitment and retention as UC benefits become less competitive. Vice President Lloyd acknowledged the shortfall in consultation and committed to improving Senate engagement. She also acknowledged the concern about eroding employer contributions and stated that all cost-saving options are on the table about how to address the rising cost of healthcare.
- HCTF Chair Vickie Mays noted that the HCTF includes faculty experts in healthcare, benefits design, and related fields. She explained that HCTF seeks a closer partnership with UC HR and greater faculty involvement in benefits governance to ensure that faculty needs are considered during negotiations. HCTF would like faculty to be consulted on plan design and cost-sharing changes well in advance and have access to internal cost analyses and insurer contract details. HCTF is exploring reconfiguration of its current meeting schedule to better enable effective and timely shared governance. Vice President Lloyd responded by reaffirming UCOP's commitment to earlier Senate engagement and ensuring that the HCTF is consulted sooner in the decision-making process.
- Faculty noted instances where both spouses or partners are UC faculty and their benefits costs are automatically charged to both of their grants—even though the family is enrolled in only one insurance plan. Senior Executive Director Jenkins committed to reviewing the issue.
- Faculty observed that insurance companies continue to make record profits even as they raise costs for customers. They asked how UC, as a large employer, might better leverage its purchasing power to reduce costs. Senior Executive Director Jenkins responded that UC does have significant leverage in negotiations and works aggressively to secure favorable terms. However, he explained that UC must also account for the complexity of managing self-funded plan costs and the risk of contract breaches require careful legal oversight during negotiations.

Associate Vice President Henderson highlighted that UC continuously benchmarks its benefits against other major employers to ensure that the negotiated terms remain competitive.

- Faculty raised concerns that UC’s dual role as both a health insurer and a provider might lead to conflicts of interest during price negotiations with insurers. Vice President Lloyd acknowledged this issue and explained that UC is actively seeking legal guidance to ensure its negotiating position is fair and transparent. Michael Ong, the Senate’s representative to the Regents Health Services Committee, added that the HCTF includes legal expertise and routinely reappoints and brings in new members—including legal experts—to address evolving issues.

VI. New Business

1. Proposal for Divisional Votes on the Common Semester Calendar

Professor Leal proposed a motion to allow each division to vote on whether to adopt a common systemwide academic calendar.

- Chair Cheung responded that Senate divisions already have the authority to conduct their own votes and that the systemwide Senate cannot compel them to do so. Professor Leal clarified that his motion was about the process, not the merits of a calendar transition. Chair Cheung reminded the Assembly that unanimous consent was required for the motion to move forward. Professor Leal withdrew the motion and agreed to revisit the item during the special Assembly meeting in March 2025, when representatives involved in the common academic calendar study can participate.

2. Proposal for Administrator Salary Adjustments to Align with Faculty

Professor Abigail Thompson proposed a motion for the Academic Senate to recommend that all UC administrators at the dean level and above receive salary range adjustments at the same time as faculty (currently October 1). The motion was seconded for discussion.

Chair Cheung reminded the Assembly that a unanimous vote is required for the Assembly to take up the item. A vote was taken, and 31 members voted in favor, with five abstentions and no votes against. Parliamentarian Katherine Yang clarified that “unanimous” means all voting members must approve, and abstentions are counted as non-unanimous. Since the motion was not unanimously approved, it could not be taken up for discussion.

With no additional business to address, Chair Cheung adjourned the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 4:45 pm

Minutes Prepared by: Michael LaBriola, Assistant Director, Academic Senate

Attest: Steven W. Cheung, Academic Senate Chair

Attachments: Appendix A – Assembly Attendance Record, Meeting of February 13, 2025

**Appendix A – 2024-2025 Assembly Attendance Record
Special Meeting of February 13, 2025**

President of the University:

Michael Drake (absent)

Academic Council Members:

Steven W. Cheung, Chair
Ahmet Palazoglu, Vice Chair (absent)
Amani Nuru-Jeter, Chair, UCB
Katheryn Russ, Chair, UCD
Valerie Jenness, Chair, UCI
Kathleen Bawn, Chair, UCLA
Kevin Mitchell, Chair, UCM
Kenneth Barrish, Chair, UCR
Olivia Graeve, Chair, UCSD
Steven Hetts, Chair, UCSF
Rita Raley, Chair, UCSB
Matthew McCarthy, Chair, UCSC
Deborah Swenson, Chair, BOARS
James Bisley, Chair, CCGA
Katherine Meltzoff, Chair, UCAADE
Sean Malloy, Chair, UCAP (absent)
Rachael Goodhue, Chair, UCEP
Juan Pablo Pardo-Guerra, Chair, UCFW
Susanne Nicolas, Chair, UCORP
Tim Groeling, Chair, UCPB

Berkeley (5)

Mark Goble
Tyrone Hayes
Mark Stacey (alt for Jonah Levy)
Jelani Nelson (alt for Daniel Sargent)
Dean Toste

Davis (6)

Niels Gronbech-Jensen (absent)
Kristin Lagattuta
Walter Leal
Abigail Thompson
Rena Zieve
Karen Zito

Irvine (4)

Noah Askin (absent)
German Andres Enciso
Oliver Eng
Douglas (Bert) Winther-Tamaki

Los Angeles (7)

Christopher Colwell
Mekonnen Gebremichael (absent)
Ronald D. Hays
Jody Kreiman
Reynaldo Macias (absent)
Moritz Meyer-ter-Vehn
Robert Zeithammer

Merced (1)

Sarah Depaoli (alt for Shilpa Khatri)

Riverside (2)

Jennifer Hughes
Manuela Martins-Green

San Diego (5)

Marianna Alperin
Kimberly Cooper
Gabriella Caballero Hernandez (absent)
Julia Ortony
Deborah Stein

San Francisco (5)

Ifeyinwa Asiodu
Robin Corelli
David Hwang
Kewchang Lee
Soo-Jeong Lee

Santa Barbara (3)

Eileen Boris
Joao Hespanha (alt for Sabine Fruhstuck)
Charles Jones

Santa Cruz (2)

Melissa Caldwell
Rita Mehta (absent)

Secretary/Parliamentarian

Katherine Yang (UCSF)