



**ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
March 25, 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 Tuesday, March 25, 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 two topics:

- 1. Salary Adjustments for Administrators**
- 2. UC Systemwide Academic Calendar**

Chair Cheung asked Senate members to keep remarks at two 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 agenda items or any proposed actions 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 agenda items and only with the unanimous consent of the voting Assembly members present.

III. Salary Adjustments for Administrators

Issue and Background: At its [February 13, 2025 special meeting](#), the Assembly discussed concerns about differing salary adjustment timelines for faculty and administrators. 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 Office of the President (UCOP) leadership decided to return to an October 1 salary range 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.

At the February 13 meeting, an Assembly member proposed a formal motion recommending that all administrators receive salary increases on October 1, aligning them with the timeline for faculty. The signatories of the petition for the March 25, 2025 special meeting requested that the following motion be put forward for Assembly discussion and action:

"The Academic Senate recommends that all University of California administrators at the Dean level and above receive salary range adjustments at the same time as the regular faculty."

Chair Cheung clarified that salaries of deans and members of the Senior Management Group (SMG) are set through a separate process from the faculty compensation structure that considers market conditions, administrative responsibilities, and other distinct factors. While SMG members and most deans receive salary increases on July 1, some deans are tied to the October 1 adjustment date due to their underlying faculty appointments. This means that deans who remain on the faculty salary scales continue to follow the same timeline as faculty for general range adjustments, whereas those fully transitioned to administrative salary structures receive increases on July 1 .

Discussion Highlights:

Arguments Against the Motion:

- Several faculty noted that when faculty salary adjustments were moved from July to October in 2019, UCOP offset the delay by providing faculty a 5.33% increase—higher than the 3% increase received by administrators. This included a 1.33% adjustment to compensate for the later implementation date. Some questioned whether there was any real inequity, given that UCOP had already addressed the timeline issue.
- Some faculty raised concerns that implementing the change would create additional administrative burdens, particularly given ongoing budget cuts and staff shortages across UC campuses. If the shift required staff time or adjustments to existing payroll systems, it could add costs at a time when campuses are struggling financially.
- Some viewed the motion as symbolic rather than addressing broader concerns about administrator salary increases. They noted that while aligning adjustment dates might carry symbolic weight, it would not address the larger issue of faculty-administrator pay disparity. Some preferred focusing on the disproportionate salary increases received by high-level administrators. Others, including Chair Cheung, expressed concern that the proposal was more about punishing administrators than achieving meaningful change around faculty salary compression or overall pay equity.
- A few pointed out that if administrators' raises were delayed to October 1, they would likely demand an equivalent percentage increase to compensate for the shift. This could mean that any potential financial "savings" from the delay would be neutralized by salary adjustments.

Arguments in Favor of the Motion:

- Supporters of the motion argued that aligning salary adjustments would promote equity and fairness and demonstrate shared financial sacrifices amid budget challenges. Some emphasized that separate pay increase timelines reinforce a perception that faculty are treated as secondary to administrators in UC's financial priorities. Aligning faculty and administrator raises would demonstrate that all UC employees are subject to the same financial realities.
- Some faculty expressed frustration over recent salary increases for high-level administrators (some as high as 30%), while faculty salaries have remained comparatively stagnant. Proponents argued that delaying administrator raises to match faculty timelines would help demonstrate administrative accountability.
- Faculty noted that the motion, while symbolic, would send a message about the disparity between faculty and administrator compensation, and would be a modest but important step toward addressing the larger issue of administrator salary growth. Several noted that even if the financial impact of the change was minor, it would send a message that the UC faculty expects greater equity.
- Supporters pointed out that early-career faculty or those who rely on summer salary may be more vulnerable to cash flow issues caused by a later adjustment date. A delayed increase may

not burden highly paid administrators, but faculty in lower salary brackets could experience strain from waiting additional months.

- Supporters noted that UC already processes salary increases at different times for different employee groups, suggesting that UC's existing staffing and payroll structures could accommodate new pay dates without significant disruption or new costs.

ACTION: A challenge to the initial vote count led to a roll-call verification. The final tally was 20 voters in favor, 25 opposed, and 2 abstentions. The motion failed to carry.

IV. UC Systemwide Academic Calendar

Issue and Background: In September 2024, Provost Newman and systemwide Senate Chair Cheung formed a joint faculty and administrative Academic Planning Council (APC) workgroup to examine the current academic calendars and calendar features that can advance the University's teaching, research, and public service mission. The workgroup, co-chaired by Ahmet Palazoglu, Systemwide Senate Vice Chair, and Richard Arum, UC Irvine Professor of Sociology and Education, produced a draft [report](#), currently under UC systemwide review, to address the question of whether UC should return to a common academic calendar. The report does not recommend one calendar over another. The signatories of the petition for the March 25, 2025 special Assembly meeting requested discussion and action on the following:

1. "Deliberate on the good faith of the consultation process and decision-making regarding the 'common semester calendar' when a higher administrator in one of the eight campuses on a quarter system has told multiple faculty members that it is a 'fait accompli as it lowers cost.'"
2. "Vote on a motion to allow each Division to vote and decide whether to adopt the 'common semester calendar' for their specific campus or remain on a quarter system."

Discussion Highlights:

- Several faculty members expressed frustration that they had only recently become aware of the common calendar study. Some reported that the issue had not been discussed in their departments or divisions.
- Reports that some administrators at quarter-system campuses had described the common calendar transition as inevitable led to skepticism about the good faith of the consultation process. Faculty questioned whether their feedback would genuinely influence any decision about campus academic calendars.
- Many faculty members argued that consultation alone was insufficient and that Senate divisions should have the opportunity to vote on any calendar change rather than merely provide input.
- Chair Cheung clarified that the proposed motion does not change the right of Senate divisions to vote on any issue of interest to their division. The systemwide Senate does not have authority to compel a division to vote on any matter unless it is through the memorial process outlined in Senate Bylaw 90. In addition, the final decision on any proposal for a common calendar would require approval by the Board of Regents, following consultation with the Academic Senate and UCOP.

Arguments Against Quarter-System Campuses Moving to a Semester System

- Faculty from quarter-system campuses warned that transitioning would require a complete overhaul of curricula, student advising, and scheduling. In fields such as math, sciences, and engineering, courses are structured sequentially across three quarters, and converting to a semester system would require major curricular redesigns. Faculty highlighted that the quarter

system allows for dedicated research time for faculty, which could be reduced under a semester model.

- These changes would impose significant costs, estimated in the report to be as high as \$370M total. Given ongoing budget cuts, some questioned why funds would be used for this change rather than to address financial shortfalls.
- Several speakers cited research suggesting that semesters could relate to lower grades, increased dropout rates, and delayed graduation, especially for transfer students who rely on flexible course scheduling. Fewer terms per year could limit students' ability to retake courses and advance in their programs efficiently.
- Faculty cited the impact of climate change on inland campuses as a factor that had not been fully considered in the report, raising concerns that a shift to an earlier start date in August would expose students and faculty to extreme temperatures.

Arguments in Favor of Quarter-System Campuses Moving to a Semester System

- Several faculty members expressed support for the semester system, arguing that a longer academic term allows for deeper engagement and more thoughtful coursework. Individual faculty from humanities fields noted that the semester calendar provides more time for deep engagement in longer-term projects, papers, and discussions.
- Some noted that many universities, including two UC campuses and most CSUs, operate on a semester system, which could facilitate cross-campus collaborations and make student transfer and course articulations easier, and provide opportunities for broader student internship experiences.
- There was also discussion about adjusting the quarter schedule rather than substituting it with a semester schedule. Some suggested modifying the quarter-system calendar rather than switching to semesters, for example, starting earlier in September to provide a longer winter break.

Motion on a Divisional Vote

Some Assembly members argued that a motion would be premature given the ongoing systemwide review of the APC workgroup's draft report. Others expressed concern about Senate divisions dedicating time to this issue now when campuses are facing more pressing crises.

The Berkeley Division proposed a friendly amendment to ensure the motion applied to all 10 campuses, including the two on semesters:

"Allow each division to vote and decide whether to adopt a common calendar for their specific campus or remain on their current calendar system."

Professor Leal accepted this and another friendly amendment clarifying that divisions were being recommended, not required, to hold a vote. The final proposed motion was:

"Recommend that each division vote and decide whether they wish to adopt a 'common calendar' for their specific campus or remain on their current calendar system."

Before a vote could be taken on the amended motion, the meeting lost quorum.

Next Steps

- Faculty were encouraged to provide feedback on the APC calendar workgroup's draft report through the systemwide consultation process, including division-level discussions and a survey

provided for community input. Vice Chair Palazoglu noted that the draft report addresses many of the concerns expressed by faculty today and that the workgroup's final report will be further enhanced by the systemwide review. Over 800 comments have been received so far through the community input process.

- Professor Leal indicated he may seek another special meeting or request that the motion be placed on the agenda for the April 23, 2025 regular Assembly meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 3:50 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 March 25, 2025

**Appendix A – 2024-2025 Assembly Attendance Record
Special Meeting of March 25, 2025**

President of the University:

Michael Drake (absent)

Academic Council Members:

Steven W. Cheung, Chair
Ahmet Palazoglu, Vice Chair
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 (absent)
Rita Raley, Chair, UCSB
Matthew McCarthy, Chair, UCSC
Deborah Swenson, Chair, BOARS
James Bisley, Chair, CCGA
Katherine Meltzoff, Chair, UCAADE (absent)
Sean Malloy, Chair, UCAP
Rachael Goodhue, Chair, UCEP
Juan Pablo Pardo-Guerra, Chair, UCFW
(absent)
Susanne Nicolas, Chair, UCORP
Tim Groeling, Chair, UCPB

Berkeley (5)

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

Davis (6)

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

Irvine (4)

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

Los Angeles (7)

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

Merced (1)

Shilpa Khatri

Riverside (2)

Jennifer Hughes (absent)
Manuela Martins-Green

San Diego (5)

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

San Francisco (5)

Ifeyinwa Asiodu
Robin Corelli
David Hwang
Kewchang Lee
Soo-Jeong Lee (absent)

Santa Barbara (3)

Eileen Boris
Sabine Fruhstuck (absent)
Charles Jones (absent)

Santa Cruz (2)

Melissa Caldwell
Rita Mehta

Secretary/Parliamentarian

Katherine Yang (UCSF)