



Assembly of the Academic Senate
Notice of Meeting
Thursday, February 12, 2026
2:00 pm – 4:30 pm

AGENDA

Assembly members are pre-registered and sent unique Zoom links for the meeting.
Other UC Academic Senate members who wish to participate in the videoconference must
register at: <https://UCOP.zoom.us/meeting/register/nEWes1-xR3SC4if8Z-ljSA>

Item	Enclosures
I. Roll Call of Members (2:00 - 2:10 pm)	Page 2
II. Minutes [ACTION] <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Approval of Draft Minutes of the Meeting of January 15, 20262. Appendix A: Assembly Attendance, January 15, 2026	Pages 3-8 Page
III. Announcements by the Chair (2:10 - 2:30 pm) <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Ahmet Palazoglu	
IV. Reports of Standing Committees (2:30 - 3:15 pm) A. Academic Council <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Ahmet Palazoglu, Chair1. Amendments to Academic Senate Bylaws 195 and 336 [Action]2. Amendments to Academic Senate Bylaw 140 [Action]	Page 9-15 Page 16-17
V. Unfinished Business (3:15 - 4:30 pm) <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Resolution Concerning the Disclosure of Names of Faculty, Students, and Staff [Action]	Pages 18-19
VI. Special Orders [NONE]	
VII. Reports of Special Committees [NONE]	
VIII. Petitions of Students [NONE]	
IX. University and Faculty Welfare Report [NONE]	
X. New Business	

I. Roll Call

2025-26 Assembly Roll Call –Meeting of February 12, 2026

President of the University:

James B. Milliken

Academic Council Members:

Ahmet Palazoglu, Chair
Susannah Scott, Vice Chair
Mark Stacey, Chair, UCB
Katheryn Russ, Chair, UCD
Jane Stoeve, Chair, UCI
Megan McEvoy, Chair, UCLA
Kevin Mitchell, Chair, UCM
Kenneth Barrish, Chair, UCR
Rebecca Jo Plant, Chair, UCSD
Errol Lobo, Chair, UCSF
Rita Raley, Chair, UCSB
Matthew McCarthy, Chair, UCSC
David Volz, BOARS Chair
Partho Ghosh, CCGA Chair
Kristen Holmquist, UCAADE Chair
Nael Abu-Ghazaleh, UCAP Chair
Jason Duque, UCEP Vice Chair (alt for
Catherine Sugar, Chair
Karen Bales, UCFW Chair
James Weatherall, UCORP Chair
Robert Brosnan, UCPB Chair

Berkeley (5)

Doris Bachtrog
Chris Hoofnagle
Hannah Ginsborg
Tyrone Hayes
Daniel Sargent

Davis (6)

Linda Bisson
Rachael Goodhue
Niels Gronbech-Jensen
Kristin Lagattuta
Walter Leal
Sanjai Parikh

Irvine (4)

Yousef Al-Bulushi
German Andres Enciso
Oliver Eng
Veronica Vieira

Los Angeles (7)

Christopher Colwell
Ronald D. Hays
Jody Kreiman
Reynaldo Macias
Moritz Meyer-ter-Vehn
Anna Barbara Moscicki
Robert Zeithammer

Merced (1)

Shilpa Khatri

Riverside (2)

Marcus Kaul
Manuela Martins-Green

San Diego (5)

Marianna Alperin
Christina Gremel
Randy Hampton
Britta Larsen
Julia Ortony

San Francisco (5)

Ana Delgado
Jennifer James
Leigh Kimberg
Kewchang Lee
Margaret Wallhagen

Santa Barbara (3)

Eileen Boris
Christopher Kruegel
Lisa Parks

Santa Cruz (2)

Melissa Caldwell
Roger Schoenman

Secretary/Parliamentarian

Katherine Yang (UCSF)



ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE
January 15, 2026
Minutes of Meeting

I. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

Pursuant to the call, the Assembly of the Academic Senate met on Thursday, January 15, 2026. Academic Senate Chair Ahmet Palazoglu 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. MINUTES

ACTION: The Assembly approved the minutes of October 9, 2025.

ACTION: The Assembly approved the minutes of November 20, 2025.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY SENATE LEADERSHIP

- Ahmet Palazoglu, Chair
- Susannah Scott, Vice Chair

Federal Investigations: Federal proceedings involving UC are active, but there have been no new developments beyond a November 2025 federal court injunction preventing the federal government from imposing fines or withholding grants to UC. UC leadership has maintained its position of not initiating litigation and instead seeking good-faith dialogue with federal authorities.

UCAD Plus: UCAD Plus, the successor to the Senate's Task Force on UC Adaptation to Disruptions ([UCAD](#)), was launched in November 2025. It includes Senate members and senior administrators from every campus and is overseen by a joint steering committee. Updates and workgroup charges are available on the [UCAD Plus website](#). In parallel, UCAD is moving toward finalizing its report, expected later this month, which will help guide UCAD Plus's ongoing work.

Budget: Governor Newsom's January budget proposal includes \$5.2 billion in state general fund support for UC, an increase of approximately \$350 million (about 7%) in ongoing funding.

Labor Relations: Agreements between UC and UPTE and the California Nurses Association helped avert strikes in fall 2025, and the University recently announced a one-month contract extension with UAW while negotiations continue. UAW Local 4811 plans to hold an authorization vote in February 2026 for a potential unfair labor practice strike. The Academic Senate is working with systemwide Academic Affairs to prepare guidance for faculty in the event of a strike.

Math Preparation: A November 2025 UCSD Senate-administration [report](#) on first-year student preparedness raised concerns about declining math readiness among entering students. The report received significant public attention, and Senate leadership and the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) are discussing next steps with the San Diego Senate Division.

PUDP: Senate Vice Chair and PUDP Co-Chair Scott noted that the Task Force on the Performance of Undergraduate Degree Programs (PUDP) is developing an assessment framework for undergraduate degree quality, with particular attention to online programs. An interim report is expected by the end of winter quarter in 2026.

Discussion highlights:

- An Assembly member questioned UC's decision not to pursue litigation related to federal actions, noting that faculty-led litigation had produced favorable outcomes and suggesting closer coordination with faculty organizations. Chair Palazoglu responded that UC's approach reflects a strategic decision by leadership to avoid litigation, while recognizing that faculty associations play an important role.
- A member asked about the scope of online programs at UC. Vice Chair Scott noted that while online courses are increasingly common, currently there is only one approved fully online undergraduate major in the UC system. However, interest from Regents and administrators is growing, and the Senate continues to emphasize careful, quality-focused oversight of online programs.
- Several members expressed concern about the potential UAW labor action, particularly the lack of clarity around timing and the implications for instruction and staffing. Chair Palazoglu acknowledged the uncertainty and noted that guidance for faculty is being developed.

IV. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Council

▪ Ahmet Palazoglu, Chair

1. Amendments to Academic Personnel Manual Sections 015 and 016 [Action]

Chair Palazoglu introduced proposed revisions to Academic Personnel Manual (APM) - 015 (*The Faculty Code of Conduct*) and 016 (*University Policy on Faculty Conduct and the Administration of Discipline*) and the accompanying systemwide faculty discipline guidelines, noting that the revisions form part of [Regents Policy 7401](#) and will be considered by the Regents at their January 21, 2026 meeting. He reviewed the background leading to the proposals, including the August 2024 directive to review policies related to expressive activities for compliance with [California Senate Bill 108](#), and a subsequent Regents' request for a review of the faculty discipline process that was prompted by concerns about timeliness and consistency.

Chair Palazoglu described the extensive joint Senate-administration review and consultation process, which included multiple iterations of a joint workgroup, consultation with campus Privilege and Tenure committees, engagement with Regents' leadership, a 90-day systemwide Senate review, and additional [analysis](#) by a University Committee on Privilege and Tenure (UCPT) workgroup. He emphasized that the final proposed language reflects and incorporates [feedback](#) from the systemwide review and preserves faculty self-governance. The amendments are intended to improve the clarity, consistency, and timeliness of the faculty disciplinary process while preserving core principles of due process, academic freedom, and Senate authority. Key elements of the revised APM language include:

- Establishment of a Systemwide Reserve Privilege and Tenure Pool, coordinated by UCPT, to ensure timely formation of hearing committees.
- Incorporation of clear, defined timeframes for initial assessments, investigations, filing of charges, and appointment of hearing committees, including provisions for good cause extensions as defined in Academic Senate Bylaw [336](#).
- Clarification that discipline calibration guidelines apply only after a finding of a policy violation.
- Revisions to mitigating and aggravating factors and explicit recognition of extramural speech and academic freedom protections, with relevant content integrated into the calibration guidelines.

Chair Palazoglu noted that additional Senate–administration work will continue on developing further systemwide guidance for determining policy violations in expressive activity cases, which will undergo a future 90-day systemwide review.

Discussion highlights:

- Following a motion and second, discussion focused on the shared governance process, improvements made to the original proposals, and concerns about the timing of approval relative to forthcoming guidance on expressive activity. Chair Palazoglu clarified that the Assembly was being asked to vote only on the APM revisions, not the separate guidelines, which will return to the Assembly following systemwide review in spring 2026.

ACTION: The Assembly approved the revisions to APM - 015 and 016 by roll-call vote (47 in favor, 2 opposed, 2 abstentions).

Chair Palazoglu thanked the Assembly and acknowledged the extensive contributions of Senate committees, faculty experts, and staff, characterizing the outcome as a significant example of effective shared governance.

V. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY SENIOR UNIVERSITY MANAGERS

- **James B. Milliken, President**
- **Katherine Newman, Provost and Executive Vice President, Academic Affairs**
- **Nathan Brostrom, Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer**

Remarks from the President: President Milliken reflected on his first five months as UC President, highlighting several positive developments. He noted UC’s global impact, citing the multiple Nobel Prizes awarded in 2025 to UC faculty and alumni; emphasized record enrollment, with the University surpassing 300,000 students for the first time; and referenced Governor Newsom’s recent State of the State address, which highlighted UC’s role in driving the state’s economy and innovation.

Turning to current challenges, President Milliken discussed ongoing federal investigations and enforcement actions. He reiterated that UC rejected the proposed \$1 billion payment first proposed in August 2025, and that while the University remains open to good faith discussions with the federal government, it will not compromise its governance, academic freedom, or mission. He reported that following federal court decisions, most funding has been restored and no additional penalties imposed since August, though uncertainty remains.

President Milliken characterized the Governor’s January budget proposal as a strong starting point for UC, while cautioning that budget negotiations are ongoing. He noted continuing campus-level financial pressures and uncertainty in federal funding, including potential changes to Medicare and Medicaid support. He also referenced the Regents’ recent renewal of the tuition stability plan as an important source of predictability.

President Milliken emphasized the importance of continued systemwide planning and cost containment efforts, including initiatives focused on streamlining administrative operations. He expressed support for reducing redundancy, delegating authority more effectively to campuses, and exploring both cost savings and new revenue opportunities.

Discussion highlights:

- Faculty members raised questions about the appeal of recent federal court rulings and how that uncertainty affects UC’s strategy. President Milliken acknowledged the unpredictability of legal outcomes and emphasized the need for multiple contingency strategies, financial planning, and advocacy at both the state and federal levels.

- Members also raised concerns about data security and federal access to faculty and staff communications, particularly in light of recent disclosures at one UC campus. President Milliken expressed interest in exploring whether UC's agreements with third-party service providers could be strengthened, and welcomed further input from Senate committees with relevant expertise.
- Finally, a member asked for additional details on efforts around administrative efficiencies. President Milliken noted that meaningful opportunities exist to reduce administrative complexity and improve operational effectiveness across the system, and that this work is a high priority.

Budget and Capital Finance: CFO Brostrom described the Governor's January budget proposal as a strong outcome for UC, providing \$5.2 billion in state general fund support, a \$350 million (7%) increase reflecting the 2026–27 compact increase and partial repayment of deferred funding. However, some deferrals were rolled forward, and the proposal provides no additional funding for nonresident enrollment buy-downs, which had compensated campuses for tuition revenue foregone when enrolling more California residents, leaving affected campuses at current levels. He cautioned that the proposal relies on optimistic revenue projections largely driven by capital gains. The budget includes no new capital or one-time funding.

He outlined three potential state bond measures under consideration: a UC/CSU bond, a housing bond, and a large research bond, which could help address capital and research funding needs given ongoing federal funding uncertainties.

He emphasized that UC has met or exceeded its state compact commitments, strengthening its advocacy position. He highlighted the Regents' extension of the tuition stability plan, citing improved student debt outcomes. The recent extension included a flexible additional 1% adjustment tied to the CPI (within a 5% cap) and a reduced return-to-aid rate.

He discussed systemwide administrative transformation efforts aimed at addressing structural deficits driven by rising labor and benefit costs through improved investment management, process redesign, and automation, while reducing unnecessary administrative burden on faculty and staff.

Finally, he reported that UC's AA credit ratings were reaffirmed and that a \$2.2 billion bond issuance in December was oversubscribed. UC plans a further \$2 billion bond issuance in February, largely for refinancing existing debt.

Academic Affairs: Provost Newman emphasized that despite public narratives about declining confidence in higher education, California voter surveys show overwhelming confidence in UC's research, medical, and educational missions—confidence that is reflected in the strong bond market response to UC issuances.

She reinforced the importance of UCAD Plus as a faculty-led effort, noting that the rosters of two workgroups had been expanded to ensure broad disciplinary representation and that regular progress updates to faculty would be forthcoming.

She underscored the significance of the proposed state research bond as a tool to help offset federal research funding risks and encouraged faculty engagement in advocacy through campus governmental relations offices. She also described efforts to expand international research collaborations, particularly with the United Kingdom's Russell Group and potential opportunities linked to the European Union Horizon programs, aimed at identifying shared research priorities and alternative funding sources.

She provided updates on several academic initiatives, including the Degree Plus pilot program at UCSD and UCSB, which integrates extension coursework and paid internships; the launch of Early

Career Research Awards, with a first cohort expected in April 2026; and ongoing discussions with the Mellon Foundation regarding potential new support for faculty in the humanities and humanistic social sciences.

Discussion highlights:

- Members expressed interest in the UK and European research collaboration efforts. Provost Newman explained that details are still under development, but initial work is focused on aligning research priorities, bringing principal investigators together, and exploring funding mechanisms.
- A member suggested exploring tri-institutional and Global South research partnerships, particularly in the humanities and social sciences. Provost Newman welcomed these ideas and expressed interest in pursuing a broad range of international collaboration opportunities. She invited faculty to share leads with her office.
- In response to questions about graduate student labor negotiations, Provost Newman indicated that a communication to faculty will be issued next week. She expressed cautious optimism about the negotiations, while acknowledging ongoing challenges related to economic proposals.

V. UNFINISHED BUSINESS: RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE DISCLOSURE OF NAMES OF FACULTY, STUDENTS, AND STAFF TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

The Assembly resumed consideration of a petition-initiated resolution concerning the University's disclosure of personally identifiable information to the U.S. Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights (OCR) during federal civil rights investigations. The Assembly discussed the resolution at its November 20, 2025 special meeting, and with time expiring, voted to postpone further consideration to the next regular meeting in January 2026. The amended resolution and a pending proposed amendment were therefore returned as unfinished business. The Assembly resumed discussion in the same parliamentary posture in which the item had been postponed.

The Assembly first considered a pending motion, made and seconded on November 20, to delete the final five "Be it further resolved" paragraphs of the resolution—those following the clause endorsing and adopting the Academic Council statement. A secondary amendment was then introduced to add language urging advance notification to individuals prior to the disclosure of personally identifiable information. The chair, with confirmation from the parliamentarian, ruled that the Assembly must consider the secondary amendment before returning to the primary amendment. The proposed wording of the secondary amendment was:

"Be it further resolved that the Assembly of the Academic Senate of the University of California urges the UC Office of the President and the UC Board of Regents to inform individuals in advance of the disclosure of their personally identifiable information."

A motion to adopt the secondary amendment was made and seconded. Discussion followed, during which members sought clarification regarding the interaction between the secondary and primary amendments and the effect of adopting one without the other. With guidance from the parliamentarian, the chair ruled that the Assembly must vote on the secondary amendment as written, prior to any further modification.

The secondary amendment passed with 41 Assembly members voting in favor and 2 against.

Under parliamentary guidance, the Assembly then voted on the primary amendment, which now consisted of deleting the five original concluding paragraphs of the resolution and inserting the newly adopted notification paragraph in their place.

The primary amendment passed with 35 Assembly members voting in favor and 9 against.

A motion was made and seconded to consider further amendments to the newly added paragraph:

“Be it further resolved that the Assembly of the Academic Senate of the University of California urges the UC Office of the President and the UC Board of Regents to inform individuals in advance of the disclosure of their personally identifiable information upon the request for such information from the federal government.”

Discussion highlights:

- Supporters of further amendment argued that limiting the language to requests “from the federal government” was too narrow and could exclude other disclosure contexts that might raise concerns about privacy, due process, and academic freedom. They emphasized the advisory nature of the resolution and favored broader guidance to UC leadership. Opponents cautioned that removing the reference to the federal government could unintentionally expand the scope of the resolution beyond the specific circumstances that prompted it, potentially creating ambiguity about its intent and application. Some expressed concern that broader language could dilute the resolution’s focus or introduce uncertainty about existing disclosure practices.

The Assembly then considered a specific amendment to delete the phrase “from the federal government,” thereby broadening the advisory language to read: “...to inform individuals in advance of the disclosure of their personally identifiable information upon the request for such information.”

After discussion, the Assembly approved the amendment in a roll call vote with 22 voting in favor, 21 against, and 2 abstentions.

Motion to Extend Time

As the meeting approached its scheduled end, a motion was made and seconded to extend the meeting in order to complete consideration of the resolution.

The motion passed with 30 Assembly members voting in favor out of 41 present (73%), meeting the two-thirds threshold required to extend time.

Loss of Quorum

Following the extension vote, continued discussion revealed growing confusion about the procedural posture and the final form of the resolution. Attendance continued to decline. A quorum check confirmed that the Assembly had lost quorum before a final vote on adoption of the resolution could be taken. The meeting was adjourned. As a result, the resolution was not adopted and will return to the Assembly as unfinished business at the next regular meeting in February 2026.

- VI. SPECIAL ORDERS [NONE]**
- VIII. REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES [NONE]**
- IX. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS [NONE]**
- VII. UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE REPORT [NONE]**
- X. NEW BUSINESS [NONE]**

The meeting adjourned at 5:10 pm

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

Attest: Ahmet Palazoglu, Academic Senate Chair

Attachments: Appendix A – Assembly Attendance Record, Meeting of January 15, 2026

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR (2:10 - 2:30 pm)

- Ahmet Palazoglu

IV. Reports of Standing Committees (2:30 - 3:15 pm)

A. Academic Council

- Ahmet Palazoglu, Chair

1. Amendments to Academic Senate Bylaws 195 and 336

Background and Justification: At its January 28, 2026 meeting, the Academic Council approved revisions to Academic Senate Bylaws 195 and 336. The revisions are required to align with the [amendments to Academic Personnel Manual \(APM\) sections 015 and 016](#) approved by the Assembly on [January 15, 2026](#) and by the Board of Regents on [January 21, 2026](#). The amendments to Bylaw 195 formalize the role of the University Committee on Privilege and Tenure ([UCPT](#)) in managing a Systemwide Reserve Privilege and Tenure (P&T) Pool to conform with the process outlined in the APM. The amendments to Bylaw 336 specify timelines for hearing committee appointments now outlined in the APM, clarify procedures for activating the Systemwide Reserve P&T Pool, and add expectations for timely chancellor responses to P&T recommendations. The University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction ([UCRJ](#)) found that the proposed amendments are consistent with the Code of the Academic Senate.

Per [Senate Bylaw 116.E](#), modification of a Senate bylaw requires the approval of two-thirds of all voting Assembly members present.

ACTION REQUESTED: The Assembly is asked to approve the proposed conforming revisions to Senate Bylaw 195.

ACTION REQUESTED: The Assembly is asked to approve the proposed conforming revisions to Senate Bylaw 336.

REVISIONS TO [ACADEMIC SENATE BYLAW 195](#)

195. Privilege and Tenure

- A. Membership shall be determined in accordance with Bylaw 128. The Vice Chair shall be chosen in accordance with Bylaw 128.D. (Am 28 May 2003)
- B. Duties. Consistent with [Bylaw 40](#) the committee shall: (Am 23 May 01; Am 28 May 2003)
 - 1. Advise the President, the Academic Senate and its Divisions, and the Divisional Privilege and Tenure Committees on general policies involving academic privileges and tenure [see [Bylaw 334](#)]. (Am 25 May 76; EC 28 May 2003)
 - 2. [Coordinate the Systemwide Reserve Privilege and Tenure Pool of faculty available to augment campus hearing committees, or to constitute a Special Hearing Committee, as provided for in Bylaw 336.A.](#)
 - ~~3. Constitute special Hearing Committees as provided for in Bylaw 336.A. (EC 28 May 2003)~~
 - 3. Maintain statistical records of the grievance, disciplinary, and early termination cases taking place on each of the campuses, as specified in [Bylaw 334.B](#) . (EC 28 May 2003)

REVISIONS TO [ACADEMIC SENATE BYLAW 336](#)

336. Privilege and Tenure: Divisional Committees - Disciplinary Cases (En 23 May 2001 - See [Bylaw 334](#)) (Am 1 July 2019)

A. Right to a Hearing

In cases of disciplinary action commenced by the administration against a member of the Academic Senate, or against other faculty members in cases where the right to a hearing before a Senate committee is given by Section 103.9 or 103.10 of the Standing Orders of The Regents (Appendix I), proceedings shall be conducted before a Divisional Committee on Privilege and Tenure (hereafter, the Committee). Under extraordinary circumstances and for good cause shown, on petition of any of the parties and with concurrence of the other parties, the University Committee on Privilege and Tenure may constitute a Special Committee composed of Senate members from any Division to carry out the proceedings.

B. Time Limitation for Filing Disciplinary Charges

The Chancellor is deemed to know about an alleged violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct when it is reported to any academic administrator at the level of department chair or above or, additionally, for an allegation of sexual violence or sexual harassment when the allegation is first reported to the campus Title IX Officer. The Chancellor must file disciplinary charges by delivering notice of proposed disciplinary action to the respondent no later than three years after the Chancellor is deemed to have known about the alleged violation. There is no limit on the time within which a complainant may report an alleged violation. (Am 9 March 2005) (Am 14 Jun 2017)

C. Prehearing Procedure in Disciplinary Cases

1. In cases of disciplinary charges filed by the administration against a member of the Academic Senate, or termination of appointment of a member of the faculty in a case where the right to a hearing before a Senate committee is given under Section 103.9 or 103.10 of the Standing Orders of The Regents, disciplinary charges shall be filed by the appropriate Chancellor or Chancellor's designee, once probable cause has been established. Procedures regarding the establishment of probable cause are determined by APM 015/016 and Divisional policies. The disciplinary charges shall be in writing and shall contain notice of proposed disciplinary sanctions and a full statement of the facts underlying the charges.
 - a. The Chancellor or Chancellor's designee shall deliver the disciplinary charges to the Chair of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure, with a copy to the accused faculty member. If practicable, the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee shall deliver the disciplinary charges at an in-person meeting with the Chair of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure and the accused faculty member. If this is not practicable, the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee shall deliver the disciplinary charges to the Chair of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure electronically, with a copy to the accused sent electronically to the accused's official University email account and a courtesy copy by overnight delivery service to the accused's last known place of residence. The accused will be deemed to have received the disciplinary charges when they are sent to the accused's official University email account. (Am 1 July 2019)
 - b. Along with a copy of the charges, the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee shall provide written notice to the accused of (i) the deadline for submitting an answer

to the disciplinary charges (section C.2 below), and (ii) the deadline for commencing the hearing (section E.1 below). (Am 1 July 2019)

2. The accused shall have 14 calendar days from the date of receipt of the disciplinary charges in which to file an answer in writing with the Committee on Privilege and Tenure. The Committee on Privilege and Tenure shall immediately provide a copy of the answer to the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee. (Am 14 Jun 2017) (Am 1 July 2019)
3. Within five business days after receiving the disciplinary charges, the Chair of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure shall contact the accused, the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee and/or their representatives in writing in order to schedule the hearing. (Am 1 July 2019)
 - a. The Chair shall offer a choice of dates for the hearing and instruct the parties to provide their availability on the given dates within 14 calendar days.
 - b. Within five business days after receiving the information requested in section 3.a from the parties, the Committee on Privilege and Tenure will schedule the hearing and notify the accused, the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee and/or their representatives in writing of the date(s). The accused shall be given either in person or by email or overnight delivery service, at least ten calendar days' notice of the time and place of the hearing.
 - c. All parties must give priority to the scheduling of a hearing and cooperate in good faith during the scheduling process. A hearing shall not be postponed because the accused faculty member is on leave or fails to appear.
4. Within 14 calendar days of receiving the disciplinary charges, the Chair of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure will appoint a Chair for the Hearing Committee.
 - a. The balance of the hearing committee will be appointed within five business days of setting the dates for the hearing.
 - b. If a full hearing committee has not been established within five business days after the scheduling of the hearing, the Chair of the campus committee on Privilege and Tenure will contact the Chair of the University Committee on Privilege and Tenure to engage support from the Systemwide Reserve Privilege and Tenure Pool. On consultation with members of UCPT, the Chair of UCPT and the Chair of the campus P&T will contact appropriate members to ensure a full hearing committee is available at least 10 calendar days before the hearing begins, and no later than 50 calendar days from the date disciplinary charges are filed.

D. Early Resolution

1. The Chancellor or Chancellor's designee and the accused may attempt to resolve the disciplinary charges through negotiation. A negotiated resolution is permissible and appropriate at any stage of these disciplinary procedures. Such negotiations may proceed with the assistance of impartial third parties, including one or more members of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure. However, such negotiation shall not extend any deadline in this Bylaw. (Am 14 Jun 2017) (Am 1 July 2019)
2. If a negotiated resolution is reached after disciplinary charges are filed, then the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee is encouraged to consult with the Chair of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure prior to finalizing the settlement. The Chair of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure should make a request for such a consultation once disciplinary charges have been filed with the Committee on Privilege and Tenure. The

Chancellor or Chancellor's designee should inform the Committee on Privilege and Tenure if the matter is resolved. (Am 1 July 2019)

E. Time Frame for Hearing Process in Disciplinary Cases (Am 1 July 2019)

1. The hearing shall begin no later than 60 calendar days from the date disciplinary charges are filed with the Committee on Privilege and Tenure.
2. Any deadline in this Bylaw may be extended by the Chair of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure or the Chair of the Hearing Committee, but only for good cause shown, requested in writing in advance. Good cause consists of material or unforeseen circumstances sufficient to justify the extension sought. A request to delay the start of the hearing beyond the 60 days mandated by this Bylaw must include adequate documentation of the basis for the request.
3. Within three business days of receiving an extension request, the Chair of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure or the Chair of the Hearing Committee shall notify the accused, the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee, and/or their representatives in writing of the approval or denial of the request. If the request is approved, the notification shall include the reason for granting it, the length of the extension, and the projected new timeline.

F. Hearing and Posthearing Procedures

1. The Chair of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure shall appoint a Hearing Committee for each case in which disciplinary charges have been filed. The Hearing Committee must include at least three members. (Am 1 July 2019)
 - a. A majority of the Hearing Committee members shall be current or former members of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure, and the Chair of the Hearing Committee shall be a current member of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure. In exceptional circumstances, the Hearing Committee may include one member from another Divisional Academic Senate.
 - b. The Chair of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure may not appoint a member of the department or equivalent administrative unit of any of the parties to the Hearing Committee.
 - c. Hearing Committee members shall disclose to the Hearing Committee any circumstances that may interfere with their objective consideration of the case and recuse themselves as appropriate.
 - d. A quorum for the conduct of the hearing shall consist of a majority of the Hearing Committee, including at least one member of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure.
2. Within two business days after the hearing has been scheduled the Chair of the Hearing Committee shall notify the accused, the Chancellor or the Chancellor's designee, and/or their representatives in writing of the Hearing Committee's decisions on the following prehearing matters: (Am 1 July 2019)
 - a. The Hearing Committee's initial determination of the issues to be decided at the hearing. The Chair of the Hearing Committee shall invite the parties to inform the Committee of any other issues they believe to be important. The final determination of the issues to be decided shall be made by the Hearing Committee.
 - b. The deadline for the parties to determine the facts about which there is no dispute. At the hearing, these facts may be established by stipulation.
 - c. The deadline for both sides to exchange a list of witnesses and copies of exhibits to be presented at the hearing. The Hearing Committee has the discretion to limit each party to those witnesses whose names are disclosed to the other party prior

to the hearing and to otherwise limit evidence to that which is relevant to the issues before the Hearing Committee.

- d. Whether prehearing and post-hearing briefs will be submitted by the parties and, if so, the deadline for submitting those briefs.
- e. Whether any person other than the Chancellor, the Chancellor's designee, the accused, and their representatives, may be present during all or part of the hearing. In order to preserve the confidentiality of the hearing, persons whose presence is not essential to a determination of the facts shall, as a general rule, be excluded from the hearing.

After the prehearing letter has been sent, the Chair of the Hearing Committee may at his or her discretion schedule a conference with the accused, the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee, and/or their representatives, to resolve any questions concerning items (a) through (e) above. Such a conference should take place as soon as possible. The scheduling of such a conference shall not result in an extension of the hearing date.

3. The Chancellor or Chancellor's designee, the accused, and/or their representatives shall be entitled to be present at all sessions of the Hearing Committee when evidence is being received. Each party shall have the right to be represented by counsel, to present its case by oral and documentary evidence, to submit rebuttal evidence, and to conduct such cross examination as may be required for a full and true disclosure of the facts.

For cases in which there was a hearing at the Title IX stage regarding violation of the University's policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment ("SVSH Policy"), the Hearing Committee shall accept into evidence the record and written determination from the Title IX process. Other evidence, including witness testimony, regarding whether there was a violation of the SVSH Policy will not be permitted unless the Hearing Committee determines before the hearing that the evidence pertains to newly discovered facts or circumstances that might significantly affect the determination of whether there was a violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct and that were not reasonably discoverable at the time of the Title IX process. The P&T Hearing Committee may carry out any investigation it deems appropriate for the determination of a potential violation of the Faculty Code of Conduct. (Am 9 June 2021)

4. The hearing need not be conducted according to the technical legal rules relating to evidence and witnesses. The Hearing Committee may, upon an appropriate showing of need by any party or on its own initiative, request files and documents under the control of the administration. All confidential information introduced into evidence shall remain so within the Hearing Committee. The Hearing Committee may call witnesses or make evidentiary requests on its own volition. The Hearing Committee also has the discretion to require that all witnesses affirm the veracity of their testimony and to permit witnesses to testify by videoconferencing. (Am 14 Jun 2017)
5. Prior discipline imposed on the same accused faculty member after a hearing or by negotiation may be admitted into evidence if the prior conduct for which the faculty member was disciplined is relevant to the acts alleged in the current disciplinary matter. Under these conditions, prior hearing reports and records of negotiated settlements are always admissible. (Am 14 Jun 2017)
6. No evidence other than that presented at the hearing (which includes any exhibits submitted to the Hearing Committee by the parties), shall be considered by the Hearing Committee or have weight in the proceedings, except that the Hearing Committee may take notice of any judicially noticeable facts that are commonly known. Parties present at

the hearing shall be informed of matters thus noticed, and each party shall be given a reasonable opportunity to object to the Hearing Committee's notice of such matters. (Am 9 June 2021)

7. The Divisional Committee on Privilege and Tenure may, at its discretion, request the appointment of a qualified person or persons, designated by the Chair of the University Committee on Privilege and Tenure, to provide legal advice and/or to assist in the organization and conduct of the hearing.
8. At the hearing, the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee has the burden of proving the allegations by clear and convincing evidence, except that for allegations of a violation of the University's policy on Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment, the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee has the burden of proving the allegations by a preponderance of the evidence. (Am 10 Feb 2021)
9. The Hearing Committee shall not have power to recommend the imposition of a sanction more severe than that proposed in the notice of proposed disciplinary action. In determining the appropriate sanction to recommend, the Hearing Committee may choose to consider previous charges against the accused if those charges led to prior sanctions either after a disciplinary hearing or pursuant to a negotiated or mediated resolution.
10. The Hearing Committee shall make its findings of fact, conclusions supported by a statement of reasons based on the evidence, and recommendation. These shall be forwarded to the parties in the case, the Chancellor or Chancellor's designee, the Chair of the Divisional Committee on Privilege and Tenure, and the Chair of the University Committee on Privilege and Tenure, not more than 30 calendar days after the conclusion of the hearing. The conclusion of the hearing shall be the date of the Committee's receipt of (a) the written transcript of the hearing; or (b) if post-hearing briefs are permitted, the post-hearing briefs from the parties in the case, whichever is later. The findings, conclusions, recommendations, and record of the proceedings shall be confidential to the extent allowed by law and UC policy. The Hearing Committee may, however, with the consent of the accused, authorize release of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations to other individuals or entities, to the extent allowed by law. (Am 1 July 2019)
11. The Chancellor will normally act on the findings and recommendations of the Hearing Committee within 30 business days of receiving them. Any delay in acting on the recommendations should be communicated to the parties and the Chair of the Hearing Committee.
12. The hearing shall be recorded. The Hearing Committee has the discretion to use a certified court reporter for this purpose, and the parties and their representatives shall have the right to a copy of the recording or transcript. The cost of the court reporter as well as other costs associated with the hearing will be borne by the administration. (Am 1 July 2019)
13. The Hearing Committee may reconsider a case if either party presents, within a reasonable time after the decision, newly discovered facts or circumstances that might significantly affect the previous decision and that were not reasonably discoverable at the time of the hearing.

G. Relation to Prior Grievance Cases

A disciplinary Hearing Committee shall not be bound by the recommendation of another hearing body, including the findings of the Divisional Committee on Privilege and Tenure in a grievance

case involving the same set of incidents. However, the Hearing Committee may accept into evidence the findings of another hearing body or investigative agency. The weight to be accorded evidence of this nature is at the discretion of the Hearing Committee and should take account of the nature of the other forum. In any case, the accused faculty member must be given full opportunity to challenge the findings of the other body.

2. Amendments to Academic Senate Bylaw 140

Background and Justification: At its January 28, 2026 meeting, following a [systemwide Senate review](#), the Academic Council approved revisions to Senate Bylaw 140 to update the name of the University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equity ([UCAADE](#)). The revised name—University Committee on Diversity and Equity (UCODE)—and committee charge remove references to “affirmative action” while retaining the committee’s existing core responsibilities.

During the systemwide review of an earlier, more extensive proposal, [comments from Senate divisions and committees](#) indicated broad support for removing “affirmative action” from the committee’s name. However, reviewers raised significant concerns about other proposed revisions, noting that they would weaken UCAADE by eliminating explicit references to diversity, removing language naming historically marginalized groups, and diluting core functions related to data collection, evaluation, coordination, and reporting. Several divisions expressed concern that the proposed revisions reduced clarity and accountability and could be perceived as politically motivated or overly reactive to external pressures. Reviewers emphasized the importance of maintaining clear authority, scope, and accountability mechanisms, including the committee’s role in tracking inequities, coordinating divisional Senate committees, maintaining institutional memory, and producing regular reports.

In response to this feedback, UCAADE returned to the Academic Council with a significantly narrowed proposal limited to removing the term “affirmative action” from its name and corresponding references in its charge. No other substantive changes to the committee’s responsibilities were proposed.

UCAADE was established during a period when the University of California, like many institutions nationwide, sought to address longstanding structures of inequity affecting students, faculty, and staff. In the current environment, increased sensitivity to the term “affirmative action” and its potential misinterpretation, particularly in relation to Proposition 209, prompted the committee to reconsider the continued references to this term. Although “affirmative action” does not refer to activities prohibited by Proposition 209, UCAADE determined that retaining the term may cause public confusion. UC does not practice affirmative action and remains in full compliance with state law; however, the committee’s work to promote equity, diversity, and the elimination of discrimination remains essential. Removing the term from the committee’s name clarifies this distinction and reduces the risk of misinterpretation, while preserving the committee’s mission and functions.

The University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction ([UCRJ](#)) found that the proposed amendments are consistent with the Code of the Academic Senate.

Per [Senate Bylaw 116.E](#), modification of a Senate bylaw requires the approval of two-thirds of all voting Assembly members present.

ACTION REQUESTED: The Assembly is asked to approve the proposed revisions to Senate Bylaw 140.

REVISIONS TO [ACADEMIC SENATE BYLAW 140](#)

140. ~~Affirmative Action~~, Diversity, and Equity (Am 13 May 97, Am Dec 2015)

- A. Membership shall be determined in accordance with Bylaw 128. One undergraduate and one graduate student shall sit with the Committee. [See [Bylaw 128.E](#) .] The Vice Chair shall be chosen in accordance with Bylaw 128.D. (Am 4 Jun 91; Am 28 May 2003; Am 9 May 2007)
- B. Duties. Consistent with Bylaw 40, the Committee shall: (Am 28 May 2003)

1. Confer with the President on general policies bearing on ~~affirmative action~~, diversity, and equity for academic personnel, students, and academic programs. (Am 28 May 2003; Am 12 May 2004, Am Dec 2015)
2. Establish basic policy and procedures for coordinating the work of the Divisional Committees concerned with ~~affirmative action~~, diversity, and equity. (Am 28 May 2003, Am Dec 2015)
3. Report annually to the Assembly the state of ~~affirmative action~~, diversity, and equity in the University. This report shall include a review of the annual reports of the Divisional Committees on ~~Affirmative Action~~, Diversity, and Equity (or equivalent committees). (Am 28 May 2003, Am Dec 2015):
4. Review the information on ~~affirmative action~~, diversity, and equity provided by the campus and University administrations and report said findings to the Academic Council. The information shall consist of data and analyses of working conditions, salaries, advancement, separation for women and ethnic minorities, and may also include data and analyses relating to lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender individuals. (Am 14 Oct 2009, Am Dec 2015)
5. Undertake studies of policies and practices affecting ~~affirmative action~~, diversity, and equity and make recommendations to appropriate University bodies. (Am 28 May 2003, Am Dec 2015)

V. UNFINISHED BUSINESS (3:15 - 4:30 pm)

1. Resolution Concerning the Disclosure of Names of Faculty, Students, and Staff

Background: At its November 20, 2025 special meeting and January 15, 2026 regular meeting, the Assembly considered a petition-initiated resolution concerning the University's disclosure of personally identifiable information (PII) to the U.S. Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights (OCR) during federal civil rights investigations. Discussion on January 15 proceeded on an amended version of the resolution, including multiple proposed amendments affecting the concluding "Be it further resolved" clauses.

During the January 15 meeting, the Assembly approved amendments modifying the resolution's concluding provisions but lost quorum before it could complete consideration and vote on final adoption. As a result, the amended resolution was not adopted and was carried forward as unfinished business.

The amended resolution therefore returns to the Assembly for action at the February 12, 2026 meeting, pursuant to *American Institute of Parliamentarians Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure* (2nd ed., 2023), Unfinished Business. The Assembly will resume consideration in the same parliamentary posture in which the matter was postponed.

ACTION REQUESTED: The Assembly is asked to vote on the amended resolution.

Resolution

Whereas on December 18, 2024, the University of California offered to enter in an agreement with the Department of Education to provide the Office of Civil Rights with "an electronic sortable spreadsheet or other file of the responses by the University or the individual campus to all complaints and reports alleging discrimination, including harassment and disparate treatment, on the basis of actual or perceived national origin, including shared Jewish, Palestinian, Muslim, and/or Arab ancestry, or association with these national origins/ancestries, during the preceding academic year at UCLA, UCSB, UCSD, UCD, and UCSC."

Whereas the University agreed to share with the Office of Civil Rights the names of faculty members, students, staff, and others who reported ("the reporter"), the individual allegedly subjected to discrimination or harassment ("the complainant"), the individuals who (have been allegedly) engaged in discrimination/harassment ("the respondent(s)"), and any witnesses to the alleged incidents, regardless of the outcome of the cases.

Whereas on November 19, 2025, Deputy General Counsel Allison Woodall from UC Legal clarified that "UC complied with its reporting obligation under the agreement on September 30, 2025, by providing ED-OCR with a spreadsheet of relevant civil rights complaints that redacted all personally identifiable information from the spreadsheet. Therefore, no names or other personally identifiable information were released."

Whereas there have been credible allegations that the current U.S. Presidential Administration has attempted to deport noncitizens, including scholars and students, who have been lawfully admitted to the United States, based on First Amendment-protected speech and advocacy with which the Administration disagrees.

Whereas on October 27, 2025, the Academic Council of the Academic Senate issued a statement expressing strong concern over the University's disclosure of personally identifiable information (PII) to

federal authorities during an investigation of UC Berkeley by the Office of Civil Rights, warning of harm to academic freedom and trust, and urging the UC administration to strengthen privacy safeguards, ensure timely notifications, and consult faculty experts on future disclosure decisions.

Be it therefore resolved that the Assembly of the Academic Senate of the University of California endorses, affirms, and adopts the Statement issued by the Academic Senate Council.

Be it further resolved that the Assembly of the Academic Senate of the University of California urges the UC Office of the President and the UC Board of Regents to inform individuals in advance of the disclosure of their personally identifiable information upon the request for such information.

- VI. Special Orders [None]**
 - VII. Reports of Special Committees [None]**
 - VIII. Petitions of Students [None]**
 - IX. University and Faculty Welfare Report [None]**
 - X. New Business**
-