



Assembly of the Academic Senate
Notice of Meeting
Thursday, June 12, 2025
2:00 pm – 5:00 pm

AGENDA

[Assembly members](#) have been pre-registered for the meeting.

Other UC Academic Senate members who wish to participate in the videoconference must register at:
<https://UCOP.zoom.us/meeting/register/99VFZR7MSn63z6AL4hMNpA>

Item	Enclosures
I. Roll Call of Members (2:00 - 2:10 pm)	Page 3
II. Minutes [ACTION] 1. Approval of the Minutes of the Meeting of April 23, 2025 Appendix A: Assembly Attendance, April 23, 2025	Pages 4-11 Page 12
III. Announcements by the Chair (2:10 - 2:30 pm) ▪ Steven W. Cheung 1. Apportionment of Representatives to the 2025-26 Assembly	Page 13
IV. Special Orders (2:30 - 2:35 pm) A. Consent Calendar 1. UCLA Variances to Senate Regulation 780 2. UCR Variance to Senate Regulation 780	Pages 13-41 Pages 42-52
V. Reports of Standing Committees (2:35 - 2:40 pm) A. Academic Council [ACTION] ▪ Steven W. Cheung, Chair 1. Nomination and Election of the 2025-26 University Committee on Committees (UCOC) Vice Chair	Page 53
VI. University and Faculty Welfare Report (2:40 - 3:00 pm) ▪ Juan Pablo Pardo-Guerra, Chair, University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW)	
VII. Announcements by the President and other Senior University Managers (3:00 - 4:00 pm) ▪ Michael V. Drake, President ▪ Katherine S. Newman, Provost and Executive Vice President. ▪ Nathan Brostrom, Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer	
VIII. Resolution on Use of Trellix and Similar Monitoring Software [ACTION] (4:00 - 5:00 pm)	Page 54

- IX. Reports on Special Committees [NONE]**
 - X. Petitions of Students [NONE]**
 - XI. New Business**
-

I. Roll Call

2024-25 Assembly Roll Call – Meeting of June 12, 2025

President of the University:

Michael Drake

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
Rita Raley, Chair, UCSB
Matthew McCarthy, Chair, UCSC
Deborah Swenson, Chair, BOARS
James Bisley, Chair, CCGA
Katherine Meltzoff, Chair, UCAADE
Nael Abu-Ghazaleh, Chair, UCAP
Rachael Goodhue, Chair, UCEP
Juan Pablo Pardo-Guerra, Chair, UCFW
Susanne Nicolas, UCORP Chair
Tim Groeling, Chair, UCPB

Berkeley (5)

Mark Goble
Tyrone Hayes
Jonah Levy
Daniel Sargent
Dean Toste

Davis (6)

Niels Gronbech-Jensen
Kristin Lagattuta
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
Jody Kreiman
Reynaldo Macias
Moritz Meyer-ter-Vehn
Robert Zeithammer

Merced (1)

Shilpa Khatri

Riverside (2)

Jennifer Hughes
Manuela Martins-Green

San Diego (5)

Marianna Alperin
Kimberly Cooper
Gabriela Caballero Hernandez
Julia Ortony
Deborah Stein

San Francisco (5)

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

Santa Barbara (3)

Eileen Boris
Sabine Fruhstuck
Charles Jones

Santa Cruz (2)

Melissa Caldwell
Rita Mehta

Secretary/Parliamentarian

Katherine Yang (UCSF)



ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

April 23, 2025

Minutes of Meeting

I. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

Pursuant to the call, the Assembly of the Academic Senate met on Wednesday, April 23, 2025. Academic Senate Chair Steven W. Cheung presided and called the meeting to order at 1:00 pm. Senate Assistant Director Michael LaBriola 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 December 12, 2024.

ACTION: The Assembly approved the minutes of February 13, 2025 with minor amendments.

ACTION: The Assembly approved the minutes of March 25, 2025.

III. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Agenda Change: Chair Cheung announced that he had accepted a request to move the Academic Council Statement, *The Defense of the University* from the consent calendar to a discussion item later in the meeting.

Motion to Withdraw Item VII: An Academic Council member proposed a motion to withdraw agenda item VII (proposed revisions to Academic Senate Regulation 424.A.3 [A-G Ethnic Studies] Unfinished Business) from the Assembly agenda in light of the uncertainty around the funding and legal status of California Assembly Bill (AB) 101. The motion was seconded and discussion followed.

Discussion Highlights:

- Several faculty members opposed the motion, arguing that the item had been postponed too long and should be discussed and voted on now, and that further delays would hinder transparency and the Senate's ability to respond substantively to legislative developments. Several speakers cited concerns about tensions with the state legislature and other state agencies, which perceive UC as overstepping its role.
- Others supported withdrawing the item, pointing to the need for further clarity on state funding and implementation before proceeding. Several noted that their support for withdrawal stemmed not from opposition to the proposal but a desire to protect it, and that advancing the proposal in a politically volatile environment might harm its long-term viability.
- Chair Cheung clarified that withdrawing the item from the agenda does not preclude future consideration by another Assembly.

ACTION: A roll call vote was conducted to withdraw item VII. The tally was 15 in favor and 25 against, with 9 abstentions.

IV. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Council [ACTION]

▪ **Steven W. Cheung, Chair**

1. Nomination and Election of the 2025-2026 Assembly Vice Chair

Chair Cheung introduced Susannah Scott, UC Santa Barbara Distinguished Professor of Chemistry and Chemical Engineering, and the Academic Council's nominee for 2025-26 Assembly vice chair and 2026-27 chair. At Chair Cheung's invitation, Professor Scott made a statement regarding her background, qualifications, and priorities.

Professor Scott noted that her Senate service includes four years as divisional vice chair and chair at UCSB and service on several key Senate-Administration bodies, including co-chair of the Academic Planning Council's Workgroup on the Future of Doctoral Education at UC. She reflected on the worsening budget and political landscape and emphasized the need for Senate leadership guided by enduring principles and an ability to adapt. She articulated two principles:

1. The Senate's strength derives from the collective expertise and long-term commitment of UC faculty. Senate leaders should take strong positions when there is broad consensus and defend the right of faculty to express diverse views when consensus is absent. She identified three widely shared faculty values:
 - Academic decisions should be made by faculty as disciplinary experts.
 - Graduate education is central to UC's mission in teaching, research, and service.
 - Students and faculty from underrepresented groups must be meaningfully included in UC communities.
2. Effective shared governance requires the Senate to be a reliable and engaged partner with the administration and the Regents. Mutual trust, respect, and willingness to work through conflict are essential to advancing UC's goals.

After her remarks, Professor Scott briefly left the meeting. Chair Cheung asked for any objections to her nomination. Hearing none, he asked for a motion to approve her election.

ACTION: The Assembly voted to elect Professor Scott as 2025-2026 Assembly vice chair.

B. Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS)

▪ **Deborah Swenson, BOARS Chair**

1. Revisions to Senate Bylaw 145

Background: At its April 2, 2025 meeting, the Academic Council approved revisions to Senate Bylaw (SB) 145.B.7 to incorporate expectations about how the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) consults with the California K-12 system. In response to requests to the Senate from the UC Board of Regents and the chairs of the California Assembly Committee on Higher Education and the California Assembly Committee on Education, BOARS seeks to codify consultation with the State Board of Education (SBE) and K-12 in Senate Bylaw 145.B.7. BOARS is also updating the language in SB 145.B.6 to clarify the scope of the A-G course lists and align the terminology with Senate Regulation 424.A.3. The Senate is expected to present an update on the proposed new process for K-12 consultation at the May 2025 meeting of the Regents Academic and Student Affairs Committee. To facilitate this, BOARS requested Academic Council's expedited review to allow for final approval by the Assembly of the Academic Senate on April 23, 2025.

ACTION: A roll call vote was conducted. The tally was 42 in favor and 1 opposed, with 9 abstentions, reaching the two-thirds majority required by Senate Bylaw 116.E for amending a Senate bylaw.

V. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY SENATE LEADERSHIP

- **Steven W. Cheung, Chair**
- **Ahmet Palazoglu, Vice Chair**

Leadership Searches: Searches for several senior UC leaders—successors to President Drake, UCSB Chancellor Yang, and UCR Chancellor Wilcox, and a new vice provost for faculty affairs—are nearing conclusion, with an announcement about the president expected at the May Regents meeting.

Senate Memorials: All nine Senate divisions voted in opposition to two UCSF-initiated Senate memorials proposing to extend Senate membership to faculty with > 50% effort in the Health Sciences Clinical and Adjunct Professor series.

Hiring Freeze: A UC systemwide hiring freeze announced by President Drake at the March Regents meeting took effect March 31, 2025. All open positions are subject to the freeze; however, positions with an already issued offer letter on or before March 31 will be honored. Exceptions will require justification.

DEI Statements: The Regents eliminated standalone diversity statements in faculty recruitment, while maintaining recognition of faculty contributions to diversity, equity, and inclusion (DEI) in advancement and promotion under APM 210.1.d.

Student Visas: The federal government canceled visas for approximately 160 UC international students. A UCEP-CCGA guidance letter affirms that such students may finish degrees remotely if they meet internal UC policies. Students are encouraged to work with their academic advisor or department to design a remote program of study or arrange for remote thesis or doctoral defense that will allow them to graduate.

Total Remuneration & Benefits Studies: Senate representatives are actively engaged in the design of two UC Systemwide Human Resources-led studies. Completion of both studies before fall 2025 is unlikely.

Faculty Discipline Workgroup: A joint Senate-administration workgroup has developed a draft report for discussion at the May 2025 Regents meeting addressing options for situations in which a Privilege and Tenure hearing panel is having difficulties convening, including when faculty are unable or unwilling to serve; options to shorten misconduct investigations; and a monitoring system for case delays.

UCAD Task Force: A new Academic Council Task Force on UC Adaptation to Disruptions (UCAD), chaired by Senate Vice Chair Ahmet Palazoglu, is meeting weekly to develop short- and long-term strategies. UCAD has created a [website](#) and email for general faculty input. The task force's interim report to the Council is due June 18, 2025. It may continue work through summer and fall due to the evolving nature of national policy impacts.

Discussion highlights:

- An Assembly member noted that their campus is seeing a rise in student complaints to the Office for the Prevention of Harassment and Discrimination (OPHD) about classroom content, often related to sensitive but course-relevant material. Although few complaints result in investigations, the frequency is increasing faculty anxiety and could impact academic freedom.

- Chair Cheung acknowledged this concern and emphasized that the Regents are aware of the risks of faculty self-censorship and intimidation. He committed to advocating for academic freedom.

VI. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY SENIOR UNIVERSITY MANAGERS

- **Michael V. Drake, President**
- **Katherine Newman, Provost and Executive Vice President**
- **Caín Díaz, Associate Vice President, Budget Analysis and Planning**

Legislative Support: President Drake and Provost Newman each noted strong support for UC from the Governor’s Office and the California legislature despite the state’s difficult budget environment. Lawmakers understand the negative impacts of various federal actions on higher education and are seeking ways to protect UC. They especially value UC faculty research and teaching as critical to California’s economic health, innovation capacity, and public service.

Faculty Discipline: Provost Newman praised the Senate’s work through a joint Senate–administration workgroup to make faculty discipline processes fairer, more efficient, and more consistent across the system. Draft recommendations have been submitted to the Regents and will be presented formally in May 2025.

Support for Students: UC is committed to supporting students unable to be on campus, including those affected by visa issues. UC is providing access to legal services, campus advising, “Know Your Rights” materials, and guidance for remote degree completion. President Drake and Provost Newman thanked the Senate for enabling affected students to remain enrolled and progress toward their degrees. The provost is working with WASC to ensure compliance with accreditation standards.

Research Disruptions: Faculty expressed concern over the loss of federal research funding due to canceled National Institutes of Health (NIH) and National Science Foundation (NSF) grants. Provost Newman acknowledged the anxiety and noted that UC is exploring strategies to support affected researchers, including shared/recharge-based use of core research facilities and campus-level resource planning. APM policies also provide flexibility to address disruptions in merit and promotion reviews. She also noted risks to UC Health and life-saving patient care stemming from potential cuts to Medicaid and Medicare funding. A federal judge recently blocked the Department of Energy’s proposed cap on indirect cost recovery.

DEI Compliance: UC Legal is reviewing recent federal guidance that requires institutions to certify they are not engaged in “illegal discrimination” or “illegal DEI activity” to receive NIH or Health and Human Services funding. The language is vague and carries potential legal risks. UC is proceeding cautiously, with a focus on protecting faculty and students. The University continues to uphold its values in accordance with state and federal laws.

UC Advocacy: Provost Newman explained that UC is engaged in multiple legal actions challenging federal actions, some in coordination with peer institutions. While not all actions are public due to legal constraints, she emphasized that UC is fully mobilized. Advocacy is ongoing across multiple fronts, including through the Regents, the chancellors, the Office of the President, and UC’s legal, communications, and government relations teams. Groups of Regents are also meeting regularly to address federal actions.

State Budget: AVP Díaz provided a detailed update on UC’s state budget strategy:

- The University is awaiting the Governor's May Revision of the 2025–26 budget and is advocating adjustment to the proposed \$270 million net reduction in the January budget proposal.
- Although the proposed budget includes restoration of these reductions in the 2026–27 and 2027–28 cycles, UC still faces a projected \$733 million funding gap due to an estimated \$2.2 billion increase in expenditures.
- UC is urging the state to exclude non-operational items, such as debt service and legislative earmarks, from the base used to calculate budget reductions. Doing so could reduce the effective cut by over \$100 million.

Discussion highlights:

- Faculty urged UC to provide temporary funding or bridge support for postdocs, graduate students, and professional researchers affected by canceled federal grants. They also encouraged a more public and forceful defense of UC and higher education and emphasized the need to make both economic and life-saving arguments for protecting UC research and faculty work, noting that UC is an economic engine for California and local communities.
- Faculty asked for more communication and transparency regarding UC's legal strategies and federal lawsuits. President Drake confirmed that UC is involved in multiple legal actions as a plaintiff, declarant, or defendant, and that news updates on federal issues, including publicly disclosed cases, are now available online via a weekly updated [website](#).
- Faculty expressed concern that recent political pressure has led to an atmosphere in which faculty feel surveilled, and there was specific concern that UC might be monitoring faculty social media accounts. Provost Newman clarified that UC is not monitoring faculty social media and remains committed to academic freedom.
- President Drake reaffirmed UC's commitment to supporting students, patients, faculty, and staff through ongoing challenges, including visa cancellations and federal grant disruptions. The president's office, chancellors, regents, and UC's communications, legal, and government relations teams are engaged continuously in discussions about institutional responses to the array of federal threats UC is facing.
- Provost Newman responded that funding alternatives are under discussion across the system, but the scope of potential cuts will make support difficult to scale. She reiterated that research is a bipartisan issue and emphasized policymakers' recognition of UC's role in biotechnology, engineering, applied science, and the startup economy.
- A faculty member asked whether UC would indemnify faculty who are required to sign federal attestations certifying UC's compliance with new federal rules. Provost Newman said the issue is under review with UC Legal. She emphasized that UC's goal is to protect faculty from being exposed to personal risk or legal ambiguity, and reaffirmed UC's legal and ethical commitment to academic freedom.
- Concerns were raised about the limited involvement of UC scholars in shaping public responses to antisemitism in favor of outside groups. Faculty emphasized the importance of academic expertise and shared governance in guiding these conversations. Provost Newman reaffirmed UC's commitment to anti-discrimination and inclusive dialogue.
- A question was raised about whether students affected by visa revocations would be able to receive stipends. Senior leaders confirmed that UC is committed to supporting affected students through remote completion pathways but noted that stipends, especially those involving international tax issues, present additional complexity.

- An Assembly member raised concerns about the UC Information Security Investment Plan, specifically the mandate requiring installation of Endpoint Detection and Response software, which some faculty view as spyware that undermines privacy and academic freedom.

VII. Unfinished Business

1. Proposed revisions to Senate Regulation 424.A.3 (A-G Ethnic Studies)

The Assembly considered a proposal, brought to the Assembly as unfinished business from the December 2024 meeting, to revise Senate Regulation 424.A.3 to introduce a one-semester ethnic studies requirement to the A–G course pattern for freshman admission to the University. The proposal would align with UC-approved course criteria, as a new A–G subject area (“Area H”). While the total number of required A–G courses would remain at 15, undergraduate applicants would be required to fulfill the new ethnic studies requirement. It would also align UC’s admissions requirements with California Assembly Bill (AB) 101, which makes the completion of an ethnic studies course a state requirement for public high school students graduating in the 2029–2030 school year and beyond, contingent on state funding.

At the [December 2024 meeting](#), the Assembly engaged in extended debate, during which members raised concerns about unresolved implementation issues and the uncertain funding status of AB 101. A motion to postpone the vote until the April 2025 meeting passed, to allow further clarification and information gathering. Since that time, the Academic Senate confirmed that AB 101 will only take effect if the Legislature appropriates funding. As of April 2025, no such funding has been approved by the State.

To further assess implementation readiness, UC Undergraduate Admissions conducted a 2025 follow-up survey of high schools offering A–G-approved courses. The survey gathered data on plans to expand or develop ethnic studies offerings, types of courses available, implementation challenges, and support needs. In addition, Undergraduate Admissions updated its 2023 analysis to estimate how many existing A–G courses might qualify as ethnic studies based on 2024–2025 course submissions.

Discussion highlights:

- Several speakers opposed the proposal, citing the potential for disproportionate harm to students in under-resourced schools that may be unable to offer courses aligned with UC’s criteria. Concerns were also raised about misalignment between UC’s ethnic studies course criteria and the State Board of Education’s ethnic studies model curriculum. Faculty also questioned whether consultation with K–12 stakeholders had occurred for Area H.
- Supporters emphasized the academic legitimacy of ethnic studies as a discipline and the rigorous vetting of the proposed course criteria by faculty content experts. Faculty in the field shared experiences of severe harassment resulting from their involvement in developing the criteria.
- Some Assembly members questioned how the proposal advanced to Assembly after BOARS issued a split or negative vote in 2023. It was clarified that BOARS initially supported the requirement conceptually in 2020, but later became more divided as the curriculum and implementation challenges came into clearer focus.
- Critics raised concerns about the perceived ideological nature of the ethnic studies content and suggested that the proposal reflected UC overreach into K–12 policy. Supporters countered that ethnic studies is a well-established academic field that warrants equal treatment, and that resistance to its inclusion reflects ongoing structural inequities.

- It was noted that the UC Student Association, which represents 240,000 students, had formally endorsed both the proposed A-G ethnic studies requirement and the accompanying course criteria.

ACTION: Following a motion to approve and a successful two-thirds vote to end debate, a roll call vote was conducted. The final tally was 12 in favor and 29 opposed, with 12 abstentions. The motion to revise Senate Regulation 424.A.3 to add an ethnic studies requirement did not carry.

VI. SPECIAL ORDERS

A. Consent Calendar

1. Academic Council Statement on Defending the University

Professor Walter Leal moved to amend the agenda to prioritize discussion of the Academic Council's [*Statement on the Defense of the University*](#). Chair Cheung confirmed that changing the agenda required a two-thirds majority vote.

ACTION: A roll call vote was taken and the motion to move the Academic Council Statement ahead of the resolutions was approved: 45 in favor and 2 opposed, with 5 abstentions, meeting the required threshold.

Chair Cheung noted that the statement was unanimously endorsed by the Academic Council at a special meeting held on April 8, 2025, and forwarded to President Drake for transmittal to the Council of Chancellors and the Board of Regents. He acknowledged and thanked the Council members who drafted the statement.

Amendment to Include International Students and Scholars

Professor Leal introduced a motion to amend the fourth paragraph of the statement to explicitly affirm the University's commitment to protecting international students and scholars, in light of recent federal visa cancellations. The proposed change was offered as a friendly amendment and circulated on the Zoom chat. Chair Cheung accepted the amendment on behalf of the Council as friendly, meaning it would be incorporated without a separate vote.

Discussion highlights:

- Several speakers praised the statement as timely and well-crafted. Several expressed appreciation for the amendment, noting its relevance to campus concerns. One of the statement's co-authors noted that it would be impossible to completely future-proof the statement and that continually revising it may risk weakening its rhetorical impact. Instead, future statements can be issued as new challenges arise.

MOTION: A roll call vote on the motion to approve the statement was conducted. The final tally was 49 in favor and 1 opposed.

VIII. Resolutions from Petitioners

1. Motion on a Divisional Vote Regarding a UC Systemwide Academic Calendar

The Assembly considered a motion recommending that each UC campus hold a divisional vote to determine whether its faculty supports adopting a UC systemwide academic calendar or retaining its current calendar system. The text of the motion read: "The Representative Assembly of the Academic Senate recommends that each UC campus vote (according to any method authorized by

the Division’s bylaws) to decide whether the faculty wishes to adopt a ‘common calendar’ for its specific campus or remain on its current calendar system.”

Discussion highlights:

- Opponents of the motion argued that it was premature, given the ongoing systemwide Senate review of the Academic Planning Council’s workgroup [report](#) on academic calendars. Concerns were also raised about misinformation circulating on campuses about the report (it does not include a recommendation for calendar standardization).
- Others noted that UC campuses already have the authority to hold faculty votes on any issue and questioned the need for a formal Assembly resolution.
- Several speakers emphasized the principle of campus-level autonomy in calendar decision-making, regardless of the outcome of the motion.
- Supporters cited the recent UC Davis Assembly vote that overwhelmingly opposed a shift to a common calendar. They argued that a divisional vote provides a democratic measure of faculty opinion, which is important given the potentially high implementation costs associated with a calendar change.

ACTION: A roll call vote was conducted. The tally was 8 in favor and 16 opposed, with 21 abstentions.

2. Motion to Adopt Resolution Regarding Senior Administrator Compensation

The Assembly considered a resolution urging the University to explore ways to cap, reduce, or restructure excessive administrative salaries, especially in light of financial austerity and the need to prioritize funding for faculty, students, and academic programs.

Discussion highlights:

- A question was raised about the definition of “senior administrators,” and whether the resolution applies to campus leadership, athletic personnel, or other administrators whose compensation may be supplemented by private funding.
- Supporters emphasized the need for transparency and faculty input on compensation practices, while others expressed concern about the vagueness of the resolution and the need for clarity on compensation comparisons with peer institutions.

ACTION: A motion was made to postpone the discussion and conduct a vote at the June 2025 Assembly meeting. However, quorum was lost before the vote could be completed. With quorum lost, the resolution remains unfinished business, eligible for placement onto the June 12, 2025 Assembly meeting.

- IX. UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE REPORT [NONE]**
- X. REPORTS ON SPECIAL COMMITTEES [NONE]**
- XI. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS [NONE]**
- XIII. NEW BUSINESS**

The meeting adjourned at 4:30 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 April 23, 2025

**Appendix A – 2024-2025 Assembly Attendance Record
Meeting of April 23, 2025**

President of the University:

Michael Drake

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
Sean Malloy, Chair, UCAP
Rachael Goodhue, Chair, UCEP
Juan Pablo Pardo-Guerra, Chair, UCFW
James Weatherall, UCORP Vice Chair (alt for
Susanne Nicolas, Chair)
Tim Groeling, Chair, UCPB

Berkeley (5)

Mark Goble
Tyrone Hayes
Jonah Levy
Daniel Sargent
Dean Toste

Davis (6)

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

Irvine (4)

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

Los Angeles (7)

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

Merced (1)

Shilpa Khatri

Riverside (2)

Jennifer Hughes
Manuela Martins-Green

San Diego (5)

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

San Francisco (5)

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

Santa Barbara (3)

Eileen Boris
Sabine Fruhstuck (absent)
Charles Jones

Santa Cruz (2)

Melissa Caldwell
Rita Mehta

Secretary/Parliamentarian

Katherine Yang (UCSF)

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY THE CHAIR

▪ Steven W. Cheung

1. Apportionment of Representatives to the 2025-26 Assembly [INFORMATION]

In accordance with Senate Bylaw 105.A.4, the Academic Council approved at its May 28, 2025 meeting the apportionment of the 40 divisional representatives for 2025-26. On the basis of divisional Academic Senate membership as of April 2025, the Webster Method of Calculation was used to determine the number of divisional representatives as follows. There was no change to divisional representation compared to 2024-25.

DIVISION	NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIVES
Berkeley	5
Davis	6
Irvine	4
Los Angeles	7
Merced	1
Riverside	2
San Diego	5
San Francisco	5
Santa Barbara	3
Santa Cruz	2

IV. Special Orders

A. Consent Calendar

1. Variances to Senate Regulation 780 Requested by the Los Angeles Division

The Academic Council approved as variances to [Senate Regulation 780](#) proposed amendments to UCLA Senate Division Regulation A-309 (The I Grade), and to Regulation A-306 and A-313 (Grading Grievances). Revisions to A-306 and A-313 revise UCLA's grading grievance procedure by transferring review of grievances to the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils and establishing a new joint Grading Grievance Committee under the Councils. The amendments 1) update the Councils' bylaws to reflect the establishment of the joint subcommittee and; 2) update and clarify the grievance process and grading regulations. The revisions to A-309 change the deadline for graduate students to resolve incomplete grades from one quarter to the first day of the corresponding quarter in the subsequent year. Approved variances appear in Appendix III of the Systemwide Academic Senate Manual on the Senate website:

(<https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/bylaws-regulations/appendix3.html>).

2. Variance to Senate Regulation 780 Requested by the Riverside Division

The Academic Council approved the Riverside Senate Division's request for an updated variance to Senate Regulation 780 (Grades). The proposed variance, reflecting current practice at UC Riverside, would replace the existing variance approved in 1973. It codifies specific details of grading that are not covered in SR 780. Updating these records will allow the Riverside Division to accurately reflect current practices and operate within the bounds of the Academic Senate bylaws. Approved variances appear in Appendix III of the Systemwide Academic Senate Manual on the Senate website (<https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/bylaws-regulations/appendix3.html>).

February 26, 2025

Steven Cheung
Chair, University of California (UC) Academic Senate

Re: Amendment to Divisional Regulation A-306 and A-313 Variances

Dear Chair Cheung,

At the February 6, 2025, meeting of the Legislative Assembly of the Los Angeles Division of the UC Academic Senate, members approved by unanimous consent amendments to Regulation A-306 and Regulation A-313. As these divisional regulations are variances to systemwide regulations, I submit these regulation amendments to the Assembly of the UC Academic Senate for consideration.

At the December 5, 2024, meeting of the Executive Board (EB), members reviewed a revised proposal to update the grading grievance process. Members voted in favor of a motion to endorse option A in the proposal and forward it to the Legislative Assembly for consideration. Previously, the Graduate Council and Undergraduate Councils also endorsed option A at a joint meeting on November 15, 2024. The endorsed option A moves review of grading grievances to a new joint subcommittee of the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils from the Committee on Privilege and Tenure (P&T), a transition that P&T also had endorsed. The new process aligns with the bylaws and regulations of other divisions and reflects the instructional focus of grading grievances. In a memo dated January 23, 2025, the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction confirmed that the proposed amendments to Regulation A-306 and Regulation A-313 conform with Senate requirements.

On behalf of the divisional Legislative Assembly, we request approval of amendments to Divisional Regulation A-306 and Regulation A-313 below, which are variances of Systemwide Regulation 780.

Regulation A-306. Grades, General

Current	Proposed
D. If an instructor in charge of a course has been determined by the Committee on Privilege and Tenure to have assigned a grade on any basis other than academic grounds, the Committee on Privilege and Tenure shall communicate that information to the Division Chair. Within a period of two weeks after notification, guided by the Committee on Committees, the Division Chair shall establish an ad hoc committee to determine whether the grade shall be changed. The ad hoc committee shall consist of at least three members, with at least one member a representative of the department involved. The ad hoc committee will obtain whatever records are available and use these records to make a final decision concerning the grade. If the records are not adequate, then the committee may assign a grade of Pass, or allow the student to repeat the course without penalty. The ad	D. If an instructor in charge of a course has been determined by the Committee on Privilege and Tenure to have assigned a grade on any basis other than academic grounds, the Committee on Privilege and Tenure shall communicate that information to the Division Chair. Within a period of two weeks after notification, guided by the Committee on Committees, the Division Chair shall establish an ad hoc committee to determine whether the grade shall be changed. The ad hoc committee shall consist of at least three members, with at least one member a representative of the department involved. The Grading Grievance Committee, a joint subcommittee of the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils, reviews grading grievance cases, reports its findings, and recommends any actions to the responsible Council. The Grading Grievance Committee will 1) determine if the

<p>hoc committee will report to the Division Chair, who shall report the change of grade to the Registrar. In order to protect the student, the grade shall be changed, if warranted, within four weeks following the formation of the ad hoc committee. [Variance to SR 780.]</p>	<p>instructor in charge of a course has assigned a grade on any basis other than academic grounds and; 2) as applicable, obtain available records to make a recommendation concerning the grade. The ad hoc committee will obtain whatever records are available and use these records to make a final decision concerning the grade. If the records are not adequate, then the Grading Grievance Ccommittee may recommend to the responsible Council to assign a grade of Pass, or allow the student to repeat the course without penalty. The Grading Grievance ad hoc Committee will report its recommendation concerning the grade to the Division Chair responsible Council, who which shall report the change of grade to the Registrar upon approval. In order to protect the student, the grade shall be changed, if warranted, within four weeks following the formation of the ad hoc committee approval by the responsible Council. [Variance to SR 780.]</p>
--	---

Regulation A-313. Correction of Grades

Current	Proposed
<p>All grades, except DR, I and IP are final when filed by an instructor in the end-of-term course report. However, the Registrar is authorized to change a final grade: a) upon written request of an instructor, provided that a clerical or procedural error is the reason for the change, or b) upon written request of the Chair of the Division in cases where it has been determined by the Committee on Privilege and Tenure that an instructor has assigned a grade on any basis other than academic grounds. No change of grade may be made on the basis of reexamination or, with the exception of the I and IP grades, the completion of additional work. Any grade change request made more than one year after the original filing must be validated for authenticity of the instructor's signature by the department chair. Any grade change request made by an instructor who has left the University must be countersigned by the department chair. [Variance to SR 780.]</p>	<p>All grades, except DR, I and IP are final when filed by an instructor in the end-of-term course report. However, the Registrar is authorized to change a final grade: a) upon written request of an instructor, provided that a clerical or procedural error is the reason for the change, or b) upon written request of the Chair of the Division Undergraduate or Graduate Council per the Academic Senate's Grading Grievance process in cases where it has been determined by the Committee on Privilege and Tenure responsible Council that an instructor has assigned a grade on any basis other than academic grounds. No change of grade may be made on the basis of reexamination or, with the exception of the I and IP grades, the completion of additional work. Any grade change request made more than one year after the original filing must be validated for authenticity of the instructor's signature by the department chair. Any grade change request made by an instructor who has left the University must be countersigned by the department chair. [Variance to SR 780.]</p>

Sincerely,

Kathy Bawn
Chair, Los Angeles Division of the UC Academic Senate

Encl.

Cc: April de Stefano, Executive Director, Los Angeles Division of the UC Academic Senate

Andrea Kasko, Immediate Past Chair, Los Angeles Division of the UC Academic Senate
Monica Lin, Executive Director, UC Academic Senate
Megan McEvoy, Vice Chair/Chair Elect, Los Angeles Division of the UC Academic Senate

January 28, 2024

To: Members of the Legislative Assembly

From: Kathy Bawn, UCLA Academic Senate Chair

Re: Amendment to Bylaws and Regulations on Grading Grievance Process

At the December 5, 2024, meeting of the Executive Board (EB), members reviewed the revised proposal to update the grading grievance process. Members voted in favor of a motion to endorse option A in the proposal and forward it to the Legislative Assembly for consideration. Previously, the Graduate Council and Undergraduate Councils also endorsed option A at a joint meeting on November 15, 2024. The endorsed option A moves review of grading grievances to a new joint subcommittee of the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils from the Committee on Privilege and Tenure (P&T), a transition that P&T also had endorsed. The new process aligns with the bylaws and regulations of other divisions and reflects the instructional focus of grading grievances.

In a memo dated January 23, 2025, the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction confirmed that the proposed amendments to Appendix VI, Regulation A-306, and Regulation A-313, conform with Senate requirements. I submit these bylaw and regulations amendments to the Legislative Assembly for consideration.

Encl.

Cc: April de Stefano, Executive Director, UCLA Academic Senate
Andrea Kasko, Immediate Past Chair, UCLA Academic Senate
Megan McEvoy, Vice Chair/Chair Elect, UCLA Academic Senate

January 8, 2024

To: Shane White, Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction Chair

From: Kathy Bawn, UCLA Academic Senate Chair

Re: Amendment to Bylaws and Regulations on Grading Grievance Process

At the December 5, 2024, meeting of the Executive Board (EB), members reviewed a revised proposal to update the grading grievance process. Members voted in favor of a motion to endorse the transition of grading grievance review from the Committee on Privilege and Tenure (P&T) to a new joint subcommittee of the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils. Previously, the Graduate Council and Undergraduate Councils approved this transition at a joint meeting on November 15, 2024. In a memo dated May 2, 2024, P&T had endorsed shifting responsibility for review of grading grievances to the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils rather than P&T. The new process aligns with the bylaws and regulations of most other divisions and reflects the instructional focus of grading grievances.

I ask the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction to review the attached proposed amendments to Divisional Academic Senate Appendix III, Appendix VI, Appendix XIII, Regulation A-306 and Regulation A-313, confirming their conformity with Senate requirements. Subsequently, I will submit these bylaw and regulations amendments to the Legislative Assembly for consideration.

Encl.

Cc: April de Stefano, Executive Director, UCLA Academic Senate
Lori Ishimaru, Principal Policy Analyst, UCLA Academic Senate
Andrea Kasko, Immediate Past Chair, UCLA Academic Senate
Megan McEvoy, Vice Chair/Chair Elect, UCLA Academic Senate

Proposed Amendments of Appendix III, Appendix VI, Appendix XIII, Regulation A-306, and Regulation A-313

Rationale for the proposed amendments

At their joint meeting on November 15, 2024, the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils approved the proposal from the Executive Board to revise UCLA's grading grievance procedure by transferring review of grading grievances to the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils. As a result, the Executive Board proposes to establish a new joint Grading Grievance Committee under the Councils. The proposed amendments to Divisional Appendix III, Appendix VI, Appendix XIII, Regulation A-306 and Regulation A-313 do the following: 1) update the Councils' bylaws to reflect the establishment of the joint subcommittee and; 2) update and clarify the grievance process and grading regulations.¹

~~Strikethrough~~ indicates text to be omitted; **highlighted text** has been added.

Appendix III. Bylaws of the Graduate Council – Part V. Committees. Section 2. Standing Committees

Current	Proposed
[no current language]	I. Grading Grievance Committee. The joint Undergraduate Council and Graduate Council Grading Grievance Committee shall consist of five members, appointed by the Administrative Committees of the Councils: three Senate faculty members representing units that offer graduate and undergraduate degree programs, one member of the Graduate Council, and one member of the Undergraduate Council. The committee will review grading grievance cases and report its findings and recommended actions to the Undergraduate Council or the Graduate Council.

Appendix VI – Appeals, Part I. Graduate Disqualification and Appeals Procedures

Current	Proposed
** Students who believe that a grade has been assigned by criteria not directly reflective of performance in a course, may appeal by bringing charges against the Instructor. The detailed process is presented in Appendix XII of the Manual of the Los Angeles Division of the Academic Senate as well as Regulation A-306(D).	** Students who believe that a grade has been assigned by criteria not directly reflective of performance in a course, may appeal by following the Academic Senate's Grading Grievance process. bringing charges against the Instructor. The detailed process is presented in Appendix XII of the Manual of the Los Angeles Division of the

¹ Please note that these regulations are variants of systemwide regulations that may require systemwide Senate review.

	Academic Senate as well as Divisional Regulation A-306(D) and A-313.
--	--

Appendix XIII. Bylaws of the Undergraduate Council – Part V. Committees. Section 2. Standing Committees

Current	Proposed
[no current language]	F. Grading Grievance Committee. The joint Undergraduate Council and Graduate Council Grading Grievance Committee shall consist of five members, appointed by the Administrative Committees of the Councils: three Senate faculty members representing units that offer graduate and undergraduate degree programs, one member of the Graduate Council, and one member of the Undergraduate Council. The committee will review grading grievance cases and report its findings and recommended actions to the Undergraduate Council or the Graduate Council.

Regulation A-306. Grades, General

Current	Proposed
D. If an instructor in charge of a course has been determined by the Committee on Privilege and Tenure to have assigned a grade on any basis other than academic grounds, the Committee on Privilege and Tenure shall communicate that information to the Division Chair. Within a period of two weeks after notification, guided by the Committee on Committees, the Division Chair shall establish an ad hoc committee to determine whether the grade shall be changed. The ad hoc committee shall consist of at least three members, with at least one member a representative of the department involved. The ad hoc committee will obtain whatever records are available and use these records to make a final decision concerning the grade. If the records are not adequate, then the committee may assign a grade of Pass, or allow the student to repeat the course without penalty. The ad hoc committee will report to the Division Chair, who shall report the change of grade to the Registrar. In order to protect the student, the grade shall be	D. If an instructor in charge of a course has been determined by the Committee on Privilege and Tenure to have assigned a grade on any basis other than academic grounds, the Committee on Privilege and Tenure shall communicate that information to the Division Chair. Within a period of two weeks after notification, guided by the Committee on Committees, the Division Chair shall establish an ad hoc committee to determine whether the grade shall be changed. The ad hoc committee shall consist of at least three members, with at least one member a representative of the department involved. The Grading Grievance Committee, a joint subcommittee of the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils, reviews grading grievance cases, reports its findings, and recommends any actions to the responsible Council. The Grading Grievance Committee will 1) determine if the instructor in charge of a course has assigned a grade on any basis other than academic grounds and; 2) as applicable, obtain

<p>changed, if warranted, within four weeks following the formation of the ad hoc committee. [Variance to SR 780.]</p>	<p>available records to make a recommendation concerning the grade. The ad hoc committee will obtain whatever records are available and use these records to make a final decision concerning the grade. If the records are not adequate, then the Grading Grievance Committee may recommend to the responsible Council to assign a grade of Pass, or allow the student to repeat the course without penalty. The Grading Grievance ad hoc Committee will report its recommendation concerning the grade to the Division Chair responsible Council, who which shall report the change of grade to the Registrar upon approval. In order to protect the student, The grade shall be changed, if warranted, within four weeks following the formation of the ad hoc committee approval by the responsible Council. [Variance to SR 780.]</p>
--	---

Regulation A-313. Correction of Grades

Current	Proposed
<p>All grades, except DR, I and IP are final when filed by an instructor in the end-of-term course report. However, the Registrar is authorized to change a final grade: a) upon written request of an instructor, provided that a clerical or procedural error is the reason for the change, or b) upon written request of the Chair of the Division in cases where it has been determined by the Committee on Privilege and Tenure that an instructor has assigned a grade on any basis other than academic grounds. No change of grade may be made on the basis of reexamination or, with the exception of the I and IP grades, the completion of additional work. Any grade change request made more than one year after the original filing must be validated for authenticity of the instructor's signature by the department chair. Any grade change request made by an instructor who has left the University must be countersigned by the department chair. [Variance to SR 780.]</p>	<p>All grades, except DR, I and IP are final when filed by an instructor in the end-of-term course report. However, the Registrar is authorized to change a final grade: a) upon written request of an instructor, provided that a clerical or procedural error is the reason for the change, or b) upon written request of the Chair of the Division Undergraduate or Graduate Council per the Academic Senate's Grading Grievance process in cases where it has been determined by the Committee on Privilege and Tenure responsible Council that an instructor has assigned a grade on any basis other than academic grounds. No change of grade may be made on the basis of reexamination or, with the exception of the I and IP grades, the completion of additional work. Any grade change request made more than one year after the original filing must be validated for authenticity of the instructor's signature by the department chair. Any grade change request made by an instructor who has left the University must be countersigned by the department chair. [Variance to SR 780.]</p>

3125 Murphy Hall
410 Charles E. Young Drive East
Los Angeles, California 90095

January 24, 2025

To: Kathleen Bawn, Chair, UCLA Academic Senate

From: Deepak Rajagopal, Chair, Graduate Council

Re: Proposed Amendments to Divisional Academic Senate Appendix III, Appendix VI, Appendix XIII, Regulation A-306, and Regulation A-313

At its meeting on January 17, 2025, the Graduate Council reviewed and approved via consent the proposed amendments to Divisional Academic Senate Appendix III, Appendix VI, Appendix XIII, Regulation A-306, and Regulation A-313.

By way of the memorandum, the Council hereby requests that the proposed amendments be placed on the agenda for a future Legislative Assembly meeting.

If you have any questions, please contact us via Graduate Council Analyst, Emily Le, at ele@senate.ucla.edu.

3125 Murphy Hall
410 Charles E. Young Drive East
Los Angeles, California 90095

January 17, 2025

To: Kathy Bawn, Chair, Academic Senate

From: Jeff Maloy, Chair, Undergraduate Council

Re: Proposed Amendments to Bylaws and Regulations on Grading Grievance Process

At its meeting on January 17, 2025, the Undergraduate Council reviewed and approved via consent the proposed amendments to Divisional Academic Senate Appendix III, Appendix VI, Appendix XIII, Regulation A-306 and Regulation A-313.

By way of this memorandum, the Council hereby requests that the proposal be placed on the agenda for a future meeting of the Legislative Assembly.

If you have any questions, please contact me via the Undergraduate Council analyst, Julia Nelsen, at jnelsen@senate.ucla.edu.

cc: Julia Nelsen, Principal Policy Analyst, Undergraduate Council

January 23, 2025

Kathleen Bawn, Chair
Academic Senate

Re: Amendments to Divisional Appendix III, Appendix VI, Appendix XIII, Regulation A-306, and Regulation A-313 (part of Proposal to Revise the Grading Grievance Process)

Dear Chair Bawn,

On January 15, 2025 and January 22, 2025, the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (CR&J) considered and reviewed the proposed Amendments to Divisional Appendix III, Appendix VI, Appendix XIII, Regulation A-306, and Regulation A-313 (part of Proposal to Revise the Grading Grievance Process).

CR&J found the proposal to be consistent with the Code of the Academic Senate and is correct in implementing the intent articulated in the proposal. The Committee therefore submits this proposal for inclusion on the next Legislative Assembly agenda.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at snwhite@dentistry.ucla.edu or via the Committee's analyst, Lori Ishimaru, at lishimaru@senate.ucla.edu.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Shane White", enclosed in a rectangular box.

Shane White, Chair
Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction

cc: Kathleen Bawn, Chair, Academic Senate
April de Stefano, Executive Director, Academic Senate
Lori Ishimaru, Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate
Andrea Kasko, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
Megan McEvoy, Vice Chair/Chair Elect, Academic Senate
Members of the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction

July 18, 2024

To: Kathy Bawn, Vice Chair/Chair Elect

From: Andrea Kasko, Chair

Re: **Grading Grievance Revised Policy Proposal**

At the June 6, 2024, meeting of the Executive Board (EB), members discussed council and committee responses to the revised grading grievance policy proposal, in response to an EB request sent on April 16, 2024.

Members voted unanimously in favor of a motion to further review and revise the grading grievance review committee structure so that it would be centered ideally in the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils. (One student representative in favor.)

As noted in the proposal, the Senate receives less than 24 *inquiries* about grading grievances per academic year. From those inquiries, students file approximately 12 grievances. Only one or two cases per year go to an *ad hoc* committee for review.

The primary goal of the grading grievance process is to maintain the integrity of instruction by providing students with pathways for addressing concerns and resolving conflict with faculty regarding the academic assessment of student work.

There is no equivalent in the UC system for assigning a judicial committee the responsibility of reviewing grading grievances. At many UCs, an Academic Senate committee responsible for curriculum and instruction receives grading grievances filed by students. UCLA is one of only two UCs where the Academic Senate has initial jurisdiction over grading grievances. Many UCs have a tiered review process, in which the responsible Senate committee reviews grading grievances only after review by the relevant department or school or as part of an appeals process to an earlier judgment on a grading grievance.

Members reaffirmed that the Graduate Council and Undergraduate Council are the appropriate Senate bodies for this activity as they should be involved in the implementation of the policies that they make. Also, there are compelling reasons for the Councils to know what is going on with regard to grading practices.

The Councils should review questionable grades after a documented departmental effort to resolve disputes involving grades given allegedly for impermissible criteria or due to procedural error. Members suggested that the Senate determine a way to have a review “committee” associated with the Councils, perhaps similar to a GEGC or DEGC type model. Moreover, further development of a tiered review process will limit the number of grading grievances filed with the Senate.

A member observed that most grading grievances to the Committee on Privilege and Tenure involved faculty miscommunicating or not communicating as to why a student received a specific grade. The few times when a grievance went to an ad hoc committee for review of a grade was when an instructor appeared overly punitive to the students when it wasn't totally clear on the syllabus.

Lastly, members affirmed the following for a revised procedure: maintain that the decision of the Senate is final with no appeals process; only faculty, and never administrators, shall determine any grade changes; and the instructor should be informed of any grade changes.

The Executive Board welcomes a revised proposal in Fall 2024.

Encl.

Cc: Jessica Cattelino, Immediate Past Chair
April de Stefano, Executive Director
Tara Hottman, Administrative Analyst
Emily Le, Principal Policy Analyst
Diana Messadi, Chair, Committee on Privilege and Tenure
Julia Nelsen, Principal Policy Analyst
Marian Olivas, Principal Policy Analyst
Adriana Rosalez, Administrative Analyst
Brooke Scelza, Chair, Graduate Council
Catherine Sugar, Chair, Undergraduate Council

Proposal to Update the Grading Grievance Process

Revised October 2024

The Executive Board proposes to improve and streamline the grading grievance procedure at the Los Angeles Division of the Academic Senate by assigning review of grading grievances to the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils to fulfill the following goals:

- Maintain faculty purview over grading by having the Senate body with authority over academic policy review grading grievances
- Maintain the Undergraduate and Graduate Council's authority over instruction and curriculum
- Reduce the workload of the Academic Senate Chair by creating a process for grading grievances that does not necessitate the creation of an *ad hoc* committee

BACKGROUND

At UCLA, all grades are considered final when an instructor submits them to the Registrar at the end of a quarter.¹ However, a student who believes that an instructor has assigned a grade on a basis other than academic grounds may file a grading grievance with the Academic Senate. The Academic Senate reviews grading grievances from students who allege that their work was evaluated using criteria not directly reflective of academic or course performance.²

The grading grievance process maintains the integrity of instruction by providing students with a way to address specific and narrow concerns about the academic assessment of student work. The goal is to provide a remedy for the student (if merited) rather than impose discipline upon a faculty member.³

The Academic Senate receives less than 24 *inquiries* about grading grievances per academic year. From those inquiries, students file about 12 grievances per academic year; only one or two cases warrant review by an *ad hoc* committee.

Currently, Senate Regulation [A-306 \(D\)](#) indicates the Committee on Privilege and Tenure has the responsibility to review grading grievances. The committee reviews written documentation to determine whether there is evidence that a grade was assigned on any basis other than academic grounds. If the committee finds evidence

¹ UCLA Academic Senate Regulation A-313, Correction of Grades: "All grades, except DR, I and IP are final when filed by an instructor in the end-of-term course report." (<https://senate.ucla.edu/BylawsandRegulations/volume-2#RegulationA313>).

² The Senate does not handle grievances in which a student alleges evidence in grading of discrimination and/or harassment. These cases are referred to UCLA's Title IX Office and Discrimination Prevention Office as appropriate.

³ The Senate's grading grievance process is open to undergraduate and graduate students, except for students in the DDS program in the School of Dentistry, the MD program in the School of Medicine, and the JD degree program in the School of Law.

supporting the claim, it notifies the Academic Senate Chair who forms an *ad hoc* committee to determine whether a grade change is merited. The *ad hoc* committee makes a final decision concerning the grade, sharing the decision with the Senate Chair who notifies the Registrar.

GRADING GRIEVANCE PROCESS AT OTHER UC CAMPUSES

No other divisional Academic Senate has a judicial committee reviewing grading grievances (see Appendix A). At many divisions, an Academic Senate committee responsible for curriculum and instruction receives grading grievances filed by students. Many UCs have a tiered review process, in which the responsible Academic Senate committee reviews grading grievances only after they have been reviewed by the relevant department or school or as part of an appeals process where a student may appeal an earlier judgment on a grading grievance with a Senate committee. UCLA is one of only two divisions where the Academic Senate has initial jurisdiction over grading grievances.

Many of our peer divisional Senates assign grading grievance oversight to committees focused on undergraduate and graduate curriculum instruction, such as the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils. For example:

- **UC Berkeley:** Students file a grading grievance with the department chair who refers the complaint to the academic unit's Grievance Committee Chair (GCC). The GCC forms an *ad hoc* committee to investigate the claim and issues a report with its recommendation to the Academic Senate's Committee on Courses of Instruction (COCI). COCI reviews the materials and issues a final decision on the grievance.
- **UC Santa Barbara:** Students file a grading grievance with the Dean of Undergraduate Education or the Dean of Graduate Education. The appropriate Dean investigates the claim and issues a report to the Faculty Executive Committee, in the case of undergraduate grading grievances, or with the Graduate Council, if the grievant is a graduate student. The designated committee reviews the report and issues a final decision.
- **UC Santa Cruz:** Students file a grading grievance with the relevant department chair. If no resolution is found or the student is not satisfied with the chair's finding, the student may submit an appeal with the College Provost (undergraduates) or Graduate Dean (graduate students). Students may file a grading grievance with the Academic Senate only if they are unsatisfied with the decision issued by the College Provost or Graduate Dean. COCI receives undergraduates' appeals and the Graduate Council receives appeals from graduate students.

At these divisions, the council or committee determines only whether non-academic criteria have been used in assigning a grade or evaluation, and if it has, whether to change the grade or evaluation.

PROPOSAL

Below are two options for revising the grading grievance process. For both options, the Graduate Council and Undergraduate Council each have one representative and the full Councils approve the final decisions. Option A is a dedicated joint subcommittee (similar to the joint Student and Postdoctoral Scholar Well-being subcommittee). Option B is a separate standing committee (similar to the Academic Program Review committee). Both the subcommittee and standing committee meet only as needed.

Option A Dedicated Joint Subcommittee with Council Representatives	Option B Standing Committee, Separate from Councils, with Council Liaisons
<p><i>Council representatives serve and have committee voting rights; subcommittee reports to Councils for final action</i></p> <p>The Grading Grievance joint subcommittee shall be appointed yearly by the Administrative Committees of the Graduate and Undergraduate Councils, with advisement from the Committee on Committees.</p> <p>It will consist of a total of five members: three Senate faculty members selected from among academic departments, colleges, professional schools, and interdepartmental programs that offer graduate and undergraduate degree programs; and two members from the Councils. The Graduate Council and the Undergraduate Council each will select one current, respective Council member to serve as a member of the Grading Grievance joint subcommittee representing these Councils (as their subcommittee assignments).</p> <p>The joint subcommittee members will review grading grievance cases and report its findings and recommended actions to the Undergraduate Council or the Graduate Council. The appropriate Council will approve any grade changes made as a result of the subcommittee's findings and report them to the Registrar.</p> <p>The joint subcommittee will meet as needed.</p>	<p><i>Council representatives serve and have committee voting rights; committee reports to Councils for final action</i></p> <p>The Grading Grievance Review Committee shall be appointed yearly by the Committee on Committees.</p> <p>It will consist of a total of five members, including three Senate faculty members selected by the Committee on Committees from among academic departments, colleges, professional schools, and interdepartmental programs that offer graduate and undergraduate degree programs. The Graduate Council and the Undergraduate Council each will select one current, respective Council member to serve also as a member of the Grading Grievance Review Committee representing these Councils (as their "subcommittee" assignments).</p> <p>The committee will review grading grievance cases and report its findings and recommended actions to the Undergraduate Council or the Graduate Council. The Councils will approve any grade changes made as a result of the committee's findings and report them to the Registrar.</p> <p>The standing committee will meet as needed.</p>

Proposed Grading Grievance Review Process (applicable to both options):

1. Upon receipt of a written grievance⁴, the Committee Chair (either subcommittee or standing committee depending on the selected option), in consultation with the analyst, will review the submission and request additional materials if needed to determine:

- whether the grievance is a disagreement about the assigned grade

• ⁴ As part of the process to file a grading grievance, students must submit evidence of their correspondence with the instructor and the department chair (or equivalent) to try to resolve their concerns. This requirement "tiers" the process so that the instructor and department chair first address a student's concerns. See <https://senate.ucla.edu/grading-grievances> for more information.

- whether the student has adequately demonstrated that the grade was assigned for other than academic reasons

2. If the Committee Chair determines that it is a grade disagreement or that there is insufficient evidence that a grade was assigned for other than academic reasons, the Committee Chair will dismiss the grievance. The Committee Chair's decision is final; there is no appeal.

3. If the Committee Chair determines based on the evidence submitted that the student has established that the grade was assigned for other than academic reasons, the full subcommittee or standing committee (Committee) will review the grievance and report its determination within 28 business days during the academic year (fall, winter, spring). Submissions received in the summer will be reviewed in the fall.

4. The Committee will obtain available records, review the materials, and make a final recommendation concerning the grade. If the Committee finds the records are not adequate for recommending a letter grade, then the Committee may recommend assigning a grade of Pass, or allowing the student to repeat the course without penalty.

5. Following review, the Committee will report its determination and recommended actions to the Undergraduate Council or the Graduate Council. The appropriate Council will approve any grade changes made as a result of the Committee's determination and report them to the Registrar. The Council's decision is final; there is no appeal. The Council will notify the grievant in writing of the final determination.

APPENDIX A.

UC Divisional Academic Senate Involvement in Grading Grievances

Division	What Senate body is responsible?	Who has initial jurisdiction over grading grievances?	When is Senate involved?
UC Berkeley	Committee on Courses of Instruction (COCI)	<i>Ad hoc</i> committee convened by the instructional unit's Grading Grievance Committee Chair	Grading Grievance Committee Chair brings all claims to Academic Senate to issue formal decision on grievance
UC Davis	Grade Changes Committee	Office of Student Judicial Affairs	Office of Student Judicial Affairs refers all complaints with merit to Academic Senate to issue formal decision on grievance
UC Irvine	Committee on Teaching, Learning and Student Experience	Academic Senate	Students file grading grievances directly with the Academic Senate, which issues formal decision on grievance
UC Merced	N/A	College or Program Dean (undergraduates), or Vice Provost and Dean of Graduate Education (graduate students)	Academic Senate is not involved in the process
UC Riverside	Faculty Executive Committee (FEC) (undergraduates) or Graduate Council (graduate students)	Department Chair (<i>afterwards</i> : College Provost or Graduate Dean)	Student submits grading grievance to the Academic Senate to render final determination of grievance if unsatisfied with decision issued by Provost or Graduate Dean
UC San Diego	Committee on Educational Policy	Department Chair (<i>afterwards</i> : College Provost or Graduate Dean)	Student submits grading grievance to the Academic Senate to render final determination of grievance if unsatisfied with decision issued by Provost or Graduate Dean
UC San Francisco	Senate Chair	<i>Ad hoc</i> faculty committee convened by appropriate School Dean	Dean of the School communicates committee's formal recommendation of action to Division Chair
UC Santa Barbara	FEC (undergrads) or Graduate Council (graduate students)	Dean of Undergraduate Education or Dean of Graduate Education	Dean brings report on investigation of grading grievance to the Academic Senate who issues formal decision
UC Santa Cruz	COCI (undergraduates) or Graduate Council (graduate students)	Department Chair (<i>afterwards</i> : College Provost or Graduate Dean)	Student submits grading grievance to the Academic Senate to render final determination of grievance if unsatisfied with decision issued by Provost or Graduate Dean

To: Andrea Kasko, Chair, Academic Senate

From: Diana Messadi, Chair, Committee on Privilege and Tenure

CC: Kathleen Bawn, Vice Chair/Chair-Elect, Academic Senate
Jessica Cattelino, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
April de Stefano, Executive Director, Academic Senate
Marian M. Olivas, Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate
Members of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure

Date: May 2, 2024

Re: Proposal to Revise the Grading Grievance Process (v 2)

The Privilege and Tenure Committee (P&T) appreciates the opportunity to revisit the proposal to review the grading regulations. Members voted unanimously to support “Option A” with some recommended adjustments to the proposed revisions which, based on P&T’s experience, will give Undergraduate and Graduate Councils the necessary flexibility to apply their expertise to create workable processes and procedures. The rationale for these suggestions are as follows.

1. A-306(D): By specifying that the relevant Council may appoint an *ad hoc* or a subcommittee, the Councils will have the maximum flexibility to call on members outside of the Councils as needed.
2. A-313: A high percentage of grading grievances involve an allegation of improper procedures or procedural errors. Although Systemwide Regulation 708.B provides that “the correction of a clerical or procedural error may be authorized as the Division directs,” UCLA regulations only give the instructor the authority to file a change based on a clerical or procedural error. This means that students’ only avenue to appeal what they think are unfair procedures is to allege that they are “other than academic.” By also giving the Councils authority to correct procedural errors will allow them to consider delegating review of improper procedures in the future.

Recommendations.

A-306 (D) If an instructor in charge of a course has been determined by the ~~Committee on Privilege and Tenure~~ **Undergraduate Council or Graduate Council** to have assigned a grade on any basis other than academic grounds, the ~~Committee on Privilege and Tenure shall communicate that information to the Division Chair. Within a period of two weeks after notification, guided by the Committee on Committees, the Division Chair shall establish an ad hoc committee to~~ **Council will appoint an ad hoc or a subcommittee** to determine whether the grade shall be changed. ~~The ad hoc committee shall consist of at least three members, with at least one member a representative of the department involved. The ad hoc committee responsible Council~~ **ad hoc or subcommittee** will obtain whatever records are available and use these records to make a final decision concerning the grade. If the

records are not adequate, then the **ad hoc or subcommittee** ~~committee~~ **Council** may assign a grade of Pass, or allow the student to repeat the course without penalty. The **ad hoc or subcommittee will report the outcome to the** **Council Chair** ~~ad hoc committee will report to the Division Chair, who~~ shall report the change of grade to the Registrar. In order to protect the student, the grade shall be changed, if warranted, within four weeks following the ~~formation of the ad hoc committee~~ **review by the responsible Council or Council** **ad hoc or subcommittee**. [Variance to SR 780.]

All grades, except DR, I and IP are final when filed by an instructor in the end-of-term course report. However, the Registrar is authorized to change a final grade: a) upon written request of an instructor, provided that a clerical or procedural error is the reason for the change, or b) upon written request of the **Undergraduate or Graduate Council** **Chair** ~~of the Division~~ in cases where it has been determined by the ~~Committee on Privilege and Tenure~~ **Undergraduate or Graduate Council** **that a clerical or procedural error is the reason for the change or** an instructor has assigned a grade on any basis other than academic grounds. No change of grade may be made on the basis of reexamination or, with the exception of the I and IP grades, the completion of additional work. Any grade change request made more than one year after the original filing must be validated for authenticity of the instructor's Any grade change request made by an instructor who has left the University must be countersigned by the department chair. [Variance to SR 780.]

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at dmessadi@dentistry.ucla.edu or via the Committee's analyst, Marian Olivas, at [moli-vas@senate.ucla.edu](mailto:molivas@senate.ucla.edu).

To: Andrea M. Kasko, Chair, Academic Senate

From: Brett Trueman, Chair, Charges Committee

CC: Kathleen Bawn, Vice Chair/Chair-Elect, Academic Senate
Jessica Cattelino, Immediate Past Chair, Academic Senate
April de Stefano, Executive Director, Academic Senate
Marian M. Olivas, Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate
Members of the Charges Committee

Date: October 27, 2023

Re: Proposal to Revise the Grading Grievance Process

At its meeting on October 26, 2023, the Committee on Charges had an opportunity to discuss the proposal to revise the grading grievance process and regulations. The Committee focused mainly on the section in the bylaw portion of the proposal which references the Charges Committee in relation to a grading grievance:

** (A) (2) Students who believe **file a successful grading grievance** that a grade has been assigned by criteria not directly reflective of performance in a course, may appeal by bringing charges against the Instructor. The detailed process is presented in Appendix XII of the Manual of the Los Angeles Division of the Academic Senate as well as Regulation A-306(D)

Although the proposal rationale describes this as a footnote to Undergraduate Admissions Appeals, the regulations as they stand now have it as a footnote to Graduate Disqualification Appeals. There are internal contradictions in both the original and revised versions of this provision. The footnote offers “grading grievance” as a process related to appealing a graduate disqualification. This is, at best, confusing. A grading grievance is about a discrete class grade, not about gpa /disqualifying from a program. A grading grievance is not an appeal to disqualification.

Both the original and revised versions instruct students who feel that “a grade has been assigned by criteria not directly reflective of performance in a course” to “appeal” by bringing

charges against the instructor. Charges finds it confusing to conflate a charge and a grievance. The proposed revised version instructs that students can file “charges” but then, rather than refer them to Appendix XII (the Charges Process), it refers them to the grading grievance process. The focus of a grading grievance should be seeking a remedy rather than putting students in the position of charging faculty. Nor did members think that it is appropriate to put Charges in the role of evaluating academic expertise or process. If faculty misconduct occurred that was serious enough to merit disciplinary charges, students should not be held up from seeking a grading resolution while waiting for the outcome of a Charges case.

Members agreed that many departments, if not most, deal with grading grievances locally as it is—a student seeking resolution from a TA and then a professor and then the department Chair or Vice Chair. It might be helpful to codify what the procedures should be in departments.

Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at btrueman@anderson.ucla.edu or via the Committee’s analyst, Marian Olivas, at molivas@senate.ucla.edu.

February 27, 2025

Steven Cheung
Chair, University of California (UC) Academic Senate

Re: Amendment to Regulation A-309 Variance

Dear Chair Cheung,

At the February 6, 2025, meeting of the Legislative Assembly of the Los Angeles Division of the UC Academic Senate, members approved by unanimous consent amendments to Regulation A-309. As this divisional regulation is a variance to the systemwide regulation, I submit this regulation amendment to the Assembly of the UC Academic Senate for consideration.

In Spring 2024, the Graduate Council approved revisions to the deadline for graduate students to resolve incomplete grades. The proposed amendment to Regulation A-309 codifies this policy change. In addition, the Graduate Council proposed changing the delegation to approve limited extensions to resolve an incomplete grade from department advisors to department chairs. The Graduate Council and Undergraduate Council endorsed the proposed amendment at their respective meetings on December 6, 2024 and January 17, 2025. In a memo dated January 23, 2025, the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction confirmed that the proposed amendment to Regulation A-309 conformed with Senate requirements.

On behalf of the divisional Legislative Assembly, we request approval of the amendment to Regulation A-309, which is a variance of the systemwide regulation.

Sincerely,

Kathy Bawn
Chair, Los Angeles Division of the UC Academic Senate

Encl.

Cc: April de Stefano, Executive Director, Los Angeles Division of the UC Academic Senate
Andrea Kasko, Immediate Past Chair, Los Angeles Division of the UC Academic Senate
Monica Lin, Executive Director, UC Academic Senate
Megan McEvoy, Vice Chair/Chair Elect, Los Angeles Division of the UC Academic Senate

January 23, 2025

Deepak Rajagopal, Chair
Graduate Council

Re: Amendment to Divisional Regulation A-309 (The I Grade) (variance to Systemwide Regulation)

Dear Chair Rajagopal,

On January 15, 2025 and January 22, 2025, the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (CR&J) considered and reviewed the proposed Amendment to Divisional Regulation A-309 (The I Grade) (variance to Systemwide Regulation).

CR&J found the proposal to be consistent with the Code of the Academic Senate and is correct in implementing the intent articulated in the proposal. The Committee therefore submits this proposal for inclusion on the next Legislative Assembly agenda.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at snwhite@dentistry.ucla.edu or via the Committee's analyst, Lori Ishimaru, at lishimaru@senate.ucla.edu.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Shane White", enclosed in a rectangular box.

Shane White, Chair
Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction

cc: Kathleen Bawn, Chair, Academic Senate
April de Stefano, Executive Director, Academic Senate
Lori Ishimaru, Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate
Emily Le, Principal Policy Analyst, Academic Senate
Members of the Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction

3125 Murphy Hall
410 Charles E. Young Drive East
Los Angeles, California 90095

January 17, 2025

To: Kathy Bawn, Chair, Academic Senate

From: Jeff Maloy, Chair, Undergraduate Council

Re: Proposed Amendment to Senate Regulation A-309

At its meeting on January 17, 2025, the Undergraduate Council reviewed and approved via consent the proposed amendment to Senate Regulation A-309. The I Grade.

By way of this memorandum, the Council hereby requests that the proposal be placed on the agenda for a future meeting of the Legislative Assembly.

If you have any questions, please contact me via the Undergraduate Council analyst, Julia Nelsen, at jnelsen@senate.ucla.edu.

cc: Julia Nelsen, Principal Policy Analyst, Undergraduate Council

3125 Murphy Hall
410 Charles E. Young Drive East
Los Angeles, California 90095

December 13, 2024

To: Jeffrey Maloy, Chair, Graduate Council

From: Deepak Rajagopal, Chair, Graduate Council

Re: Proposed Amendment to Senate Regulation A-309. The I Grade

At its meeting on December 6, 2024, the Graduate Council reviewed and approved the proposed amendment to Senate Regulation A-309. The I Grade (7 in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstained).

In the Spring 2024, the Graduate Council approved changing the deadline for graduate students to resolve incomplete grades from one quarter to the first day of the corresponding quarter in the subsequent year. In order to enact the change, the Council proposed amendments to Senate Regulation A-309. The I Grade. The Graduate Council also proposed updating its delegation to approve the limited extensions to resolve an incomplete grade.

Minor editorial changes were also suggested. The deadline to resolve the I grade for undergraduate students remains unchanged.

If you have any questions, please contact us via Graduate Council Analyst, Emily Le, at ele@senate.ucla.edu.

Proposed Changes to Regulations of the Division

Regulation A-309. The I Grade

Current Text	Proposed changes to the text Strikethrough to be deleted <u>Underlined</u> to be added
<p>(A) The grade I may be assigned when a student's work is of passing quality, but is incomplete. The grade I shall only be assigned when it is established to the instructor's satisfaction that the student's work is incomplete for good cause. When the instructor assigns the grade "I" on the grade sheet, the grade should be accompanied by a notation specifying what work must be done to remove the incomplete. [Am 3 Dec 1980]</p> <p>(B) The student is entitled to have the grade I replaced by a passing grade and to receive unit credit and grade-points provided he or she satisfactorily completes the work of the course by the end of the next full term that he or she is in residence in regular session following the term in which the I was received. The Dean of the appropriate school or college has authority to extend the deadline for completion in the event of unusual circumstances that would clearly impose an unfair hardship on the student if the original deadline were maintained.</p> <p>(C) If the work is not completed according to the provisions of A-309 (B), the grade I shall automatically be replaced with F, NP or U as appropriate.</p> <p>(D) The Graduate Council may establish rules under which the authority to approve limited extensions of time under A-309 (B) for graduate students is delegated to departmental advisors. [Variance to SR 780.]</p>	<p>(A) The grade I may be assigned when a student's work is of passing quality, but is incomplete. The grade I shall only be assigned when it is established to the instructor's satisfaction that the student's work is incomplete for good cause. When the instructor assigns the grade "I" on the grade sheet, the grade should be accompanied by a notation specifying what work must be done to remove the incomplete. [Am 3 Dec 1980]</p> <p>(B) The <u>An undergraduate</u> student is entitled to have the grade I replaced by a passing grade and to receive unit credit and grade-points, provided he or she <u>the student</u> satisfactorily completes the work of the course by the end of the next full term that he or she <u>the student</u> is in residence in regular session following the term in which the I was received. The Dean of the appropriate school or college has authority to extend the deadline for completion in the event of unusual circumstances that would clearly impose an unfair hardship on the student if the original deadline were maintained.</p> <p><u>(C) A graduate student is entitled to have the grade I replaced by a passing grade and to receive unit credit and grade points by the first day of the corresponding term in the subsequent year, provided the student satisfactorily completes the remaining work in a way specified by the instructor at least 30 days prior to this deadline. Graduate students may advance to candidacy but not earn their degree if they have incomplete grades on any required courses.</u></p> <p>(D) If the work is not completed according to the provisions of A-309 (B) <u>or (C)</u>, the grade I</p>

	<p>shall automatically be replaced with a final grade of F, NP or U as appropriate.</p> <p>(DE) The Graduate Council may establish rules under which the authority to approve limited extensions of time under A-309 (B) (C) for graduate students is delegated to department advisors chairs. [Variance to SR 780.]</p>
--	---



CHAIR, ACADEMIC SENATE
RIVERSIDE DIVISION
UNIVERSITY OFFICE BUILDING, RM 225
TEL: (951) 827-4390
EMAIL: SANG-HEE.LEE@UCR.EDU

SANG-HEE LEE
PROFESSOR OF ANTHROPOLOGY
RIVERSIDE, CA 92521-0217

June 24, 2024

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

RE: Riverside Division Variance to Systemwide Senate Regulation 780

Dear Jim,

On behalf of the Riverside Division of the Academic Senate, I am formally requesting amendment to the recorded variances of Systemwide Senate Regulation 780 for the Riverside Division. Approval of this proposal would allow the Riverside Division to continue to operate under the Regulations as written while being in compliance with Systemwide Senate Regulations.

To assist in your review, I have attached a document illustrating the requested amendments to the previously recorded variances for the Riverside Division. This includes a side-by-side comparison of currently documented variance to Regulation 780 and said proposed Amendments. Thank you for reviewing this request. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to let me know.

Respectfully Submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Sang-Hee Lee".

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

CC: Declan McCole – Vice Chair, Riverside Division
Melanie Cocco – Chair, University Committee on Educational Policy
Mijung Park – Chair, University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction
Ward P. Beyermann – Chair of Riverside Division, Committee on Educational Policy
Monica Lin – Executive Director, UC Academic Senate
Cherysa Cortez – Executive Director, Riverside Division
Brenda Abrams – Committee Analyst, University Committee on Educational Policy
Michael LaBriola – Committee Analyst, Academic Assembly, Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction
Beth Beatty – Committee Analyst, Riverside Division Committee on Educational Policy
Moriah Joyner – Committee Analyst, Riverside Division Rules and Jurisdiction

Attachment

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA RIVERSIDE
REQUEST TO SYSTEMWIDE ACADEMIC SENATE
June 24, 2024

To Be Adopted

Proposed Changes to the documented variance of SR 780 for UCR
Appendix III 780.6. Riverside

PRESENT:

VARIANCE:

DR1.	Grading System.	A-DR1.	No change.
DR1.1	All courses shall be graded on the basis of A (distinction, indicating exceptional achievement), B (high pass, indicating more than minimal competence but less than exceptional achievement), C (pass, indicating competence), D (marginal pass), or F (fail).	A-DR1.1	No change.
DR1.1.1	Grade points per units shall be: A = 4, B = 3, C = 2, D = 1, F = 0.	A-DR1.1.1	Grade points per unit shall be: A = 4, B = 3, C = 2, D = 1, F = 0. <u>Passing grades A, B, C and D may be modified by plus (+) or minus (-) suffixes. Minus grades carry three-tenths grade point less per unit, and plus grades (excluding A+) carry three-tenths grade point more than the unsuffixed grade. The grade A+ carries 4.0 grade points per unit, the same as for an unsuffixed A; but when A+ is reported it represents extraordinary achievement. (Am 5 May 77).</u>
		A-DR1.1.1.1	<u>The grade GD (Grade Delay) shall be entered on the student's record: a) when administratively the faculty member is not able to assign a grade or b) when disciplinary proceedings are in progress. The GD shall not itself be calculated in any way in the</u>

student's grade-point average. The GD shall be changed to a grade, or an incomplete, only when the Registrar receives a written request from the instructor, or if unavailable, the program chair, to indicate that the student situation has been resolved. Once an instructor has decided to proceed with disciplinary proceedings, he or she will refrain from assigning a course grade for the student. If the course concludes before the charge has been resolved, the instructor will assign a grade GD and indicate as a note that this GD is for a "Pending Charge of Academic Integrity".(En Feb. 15, 2011)

DR1.1.2	A grade point average of at least 2.0 is required for graduation in any undergraduate program. A grade point average of at least 3.0 is required for graduation in any graduate program.	A-DR1.1.2	No change.
DR1.1.3	The grades A, B, C, and D may be modified by plus (+) or minus (-) suffixes. Minus grades carry three-tenths grade point less per unit, and plus grades (including A+) carry three-tenths grade point more per unit than unsuffixed grades.	A-DR1.1.3	<u>A student may add a course up to the end of the second full week of instruction. With the approval of the instructor and advisor, a student may also add a course during the third full week of instruction. (En 5 May 77) (Am 21 Nov 02)</u>
DR 1.1.4	The only exceptions to this grading system are in Regulations DR1.2, DR1.3, DR1.4, and DR1.5 below.	A-DR 1.1.4	<u>A student may drop a course without prior approval no later than the end of the second full week of instruction. From the third through the sixth full week of instruction, a course may be dropped with the approval of the advisor. Any course drop which would reduce the undergraduate student's academic load to less than 12 units must be</u>

approved by the Dean. (En 5 May 77)(Am 26 May 88) (Am 21 Nov 02).

- A-DR1.1.4.1 With the approval of their college's Executive Committee, instructors and departments may devise policies that drop students from particular courses up to the end of the second full week of instruction -- if students do not meet attendance requirements approved by the Executive Committee and posted in the Schedule of Classes. (En 21 Nov 02)
- A-DR1.1.5 A course dropped after the end of the second full week of instruction will remain as a permanent transcript entry showing course number and title, with a transcript symbol of W, signifying withdrawal, entered in the grade column.(En 5 May 77) (Am 21 Nov 02)
- A-DR1.1.5.1 A student who has been referred for a pending academic integrity violation may not drop or withdraw from the course to escape the consequences of the misconduct. If a student drops or withdraws from the course prior to the resolution of the case brought to Student Conduct, they will be re-enrolled in the course. Students are encouraged to attend and engage fully in the course during the academic integrity review.(En Feb. 15, 2011)
- A-DR1.1.6 The final date to petition for conversion from letter grade to S/NC or vice versa will be the

			<u>end of the eighth week of instruction. (En 5 May 77; Am 25 May 89)</u>
		A-DR1.1.7	<u>The only exceptions to this grading system are in R1.2, R1.3, R1.4 and R1.5 below. (En 5 May 77)</u>
DR 1.2	A student in good standing may undertake courses on an S/NC (satisfactory/no credit) basis subject to the following limitations. The grade S will be awarded for work satisfactory for unit credit in meeting degree requirements. In the determination of what is "satisfactory" for meeting degree requirements, instructors will take note of Regulation DR1.1.2 above. Units are assigned for courses graded S, but it has no grade point equivalent and does not enter the grade point average. Neither units nor grade points are assigned for an NC grade; the grade is recorded on the transcript, but does not enter the grade point average.	A-DR 1.2	A student in good standing may undertake courses on an S/NC (satisfactory/no credit) basis subject to the following limitations. The grade S shall be awarded for work satisfactory, <u>that is, work equivalent to a GPA level of 2.0 or higher at the undergraduate level and a GPA level of 3.0 or higher at the graduate level</u> , for unit credit in meeting degree requirements. In the determination of what is "satisfactory" for meeting degree requirements, instructors will take note of R1.1.2 above. Units are assigned for courses graded S, but it has no grade point equivalent and does not enter the grade point average. Neither units nor grade points are assigned for an NC grade; the grade is recorded on the transcript but does not enter the grade point average. (Am 20 Nov 73)
DR 1.2.1	Subject to the approval of the Graduate Council, each department may set conditions regulating the taking of courses by graduate students on an S/NC basis. It may decide that some graduate courses be taken on an A, B, C, D, F, basis only. It may require that some graduate courses be taken on an S/NC basis only (provided it proves this to be educationally	A-DR 1.2.1	Subject to the approval of the Graduate Council, each department may set conditions regulating the taking of courses by graduate students on an S/NC basis. <u>Except as provided in R1.3.1, each department</u> may decide that some graduate courses be taken on an A, B, C, D, F basis only. It may require that some graduate courses be taken on

	necessary and gains approval through the channels stated in DR1.3). The department may also allow a third (residual) category in which a graduate student may elect to take any course on an S/NC basis, provided that the student's advisor consents.		an S/NC basis only (provided it proves this to be educationally necessary and gains approval through the channels stated in R1.3). The department may also allow a third (residual) category in which a graduate student may elect to take any course on an S/NC basis, provided that the student's advisor consents.
DR1.2.2	Students enrolled in any undergraduate degree program may receive credit for courses undertaken and graded S on the Riverside campus to a limit of one-third of the total units undertaken and passed on the Riverside campus at the time the degree is awarded. Units completed on another campus of the University by a Riverside undergraduate student enrolled as an intercampus visitor are considered Riverside work for the purposes of this Regulation.	A-DR1.2.2	No change.
DR1.2.3	Courses which are required in, or prerequisite to, the undergraduate student's major subject may be taken on an S/NC basis only on approval of the chairperson of the student's department (or other primary instructional unit) in each individual case.	A-DR1.2.3	No change.
DR1.2.4	A special student or limited status student may take courses on an S/NC basis at the discretion of the dean of the school or college in which he is enrolled.	A- DR1.2.4	No change.
DR1.2.5	Except as otherwise specified by the executive committee of the school or college or division concerned, students may elect to take X or XR300, X400, or	A-DR1.2.5	Except as otherwise specified by the <u>E</u> xecutive <u>C</u> ommittee of the school or college or division concerned, students may elect to take X or XR300,

	300 series courses on an S/NC basis without reference to the one-third limitation specified in Paragraph DR1.2.2 <u>above</u> .		X400, or 300 series courses on an S/NC basis without reference to the one-third limitation specified in DR1.2.2. <u>(omitted)</u> .
DR1.3	Departments may designate graduate or undergraduate courses to be graded only on an S/NC basis, provided that they have the approval of the executive committee of the college (and the Graduate Council for graduate courses) and the Committee on Courses and the Riverside Division. Approval will be given only when the department demonstrates that it is educationally necessary for the course to be graded on an S/NC basis. A student enrolling in such courses is subject to the limitations specified in Regulation DR1.2, except that Regulation DR1.2.3 is waived.	A-DR1.3	Departments may designate graduate or undergraduate courses to be graded only on an S/NC basis, provided that they have the approval of the Executive Committee of the college (and the Graduate Council for graduate courses) and the Committee on Courses and the Division, <u>except as provided in R1.3.1</u> . Approval will be given only when the department demonstrates that it is educationally necessary for the course to be graded on an S/NC basis. A student enrolling in such courses is subject to the limitations specified in R1.2, except that R1.2.3 is waived.
		A-DR1.3.1	Courses in the 290 series (290-299) shall be graded S/NC unless approved for A, B, C, D, F grading by the Graduate Council on the recommendation of the department.
		A-DR1.3.2	Graduate students may not use undergraduate or graduate courses taken on an S/NC basis to complete their master's or PhD degree requirements, unless the course is only offered on an S/NC basis. Exceptions must be approved by the Dean of the Graduate Division. (En 24 Jan 74)(Ed 6 June 16)
DR1.4	The grade I (incomplete) denotes that a student's work	A-DR1.4	The grade I (incomplete) denotes that a student's work

was of passing quality, but incomplete for good cause. Subject to the provisions of ~~SR 634~~, units are not charged and grade points are not assigned for I grades. The grade I can be replaced as follows:

was of passing quality but incomplete for good cause. Subject to the provisions of R1.4.2, units are not charged and grade points are not assigned for I grades. The grade I can be replaced as follows:

DR1.4.1 Upon completion of the required work, as specified by the instructor, the grade I shall be replaced by a grade A to F or S/NC.

A-DR1.4.1 Subject to time limitations stated in R1.4.2 and upon completion of the required work, as specified by the instructor, the grade I shall be replaced by a grade A to F or S/NC.

DR1.4.2 When a course graded I has not been successfully completed (as specified in DR1.4.1 above) after one calendar year, it must remain permanently recorded as an I on the transcript (except that the appropriate dean may extend the time for successful completion when he considers that circumstances warrant it).

A-DR1.4.2 When a course graded I has not been successfully completed within one additional quarter, it will be replaced by a grade of F or by NC if the course was undertaken on an S/NC basis. In the case of a graduating senior an I grade will automatically be recorded as an F or NC. Before a grade of I lapses into a grade of F or NC, the appropriate Dean may extend time for successful completion when he considers that circumstances warrant it. (Am 5 May 77)

DR1.4.3 ~~As an alternate procedure, if a student repeats and successfully completes a course previously graded I, the new grade is assigned and the I is removed from the transcript. (30 May 73)~~

A- DR1.5 For a course extending over more than one term, where evaluation of the student's performance is deferred until the end of the final term, provisional grades of IP (in progress) shall be assigned in the intervening terms. Neither units nor grade points shall be assigned for IP grades. The provisional grades shall be replaced by the final grade if the student completes the full sequence. In the event that the full sequence is not completed, the grade IP will be replaced

- by the grade I and further changes in the student's record will be subject to the conditions of R1.4.
- A-DR1.6 Repetition of courses not authorized by the Committee on Courses to be taken more than once for credit is subject to the following conditions:
- A-DR1.6.1 A student may repeat only those courses in which a grade of D, F, or NC was received. (Am 5 May 77)
- A-DR1.6.2 Repetition of a course more than once requires approval by the appropriate Dean in all instances.
- A-DR1.6.3 Degree credit for a course will be given only once. The grade assigned each time a course is taken shall be permanently recorded on the student's transcript, but only the most recently earned grade shall be computed in the grade point average. (Am 8 Jan 76)
- A-DR1.7 All grades except I and IP become final when they are assigned. No term grade may be revised by reexamination. The only exception to these rules is in R1.7.1, R5.1.6.2, and R5.1.6.3. (Am 5 May 77)
- A-DR1.7.1 An instructor may approve and report to the registrar a correction of a recorded course grade at any time if clerical or procedural error has been made in assigning, transmitting, or recording the original grade.
- A-DR1.8 No student shall be excused from assigned final

examinations, except as provided in R1.8.1 below.

A-DR1.8.1 The instructor in charge of an undergraduate course shall be responsible for assigning the final grade in the course. The final grade shall reflect the student's achievement in the course and shall be based upon adequate evaluation of that achievement. The instructor's methods of evaluation must be clearly announced during the progress of the course. Evaluation methods must be of reasonable duration and difficulty and must be in accord with applicable departmental policies. The methods may include a final written examination, a term paper, a final oral examination, a take-home examination, or other evaluation device. If a final written examination is given, it shall not exceed three hours' duration and shall be given only at the times and places announced in the schedule and directory.

A-DR1.9 A maximum of 16 units of credit may be obtained through internship courses, with a maximum of 12 units of internship scheduled in a single quarter. Internship course credit is given for academic work related to the experience of the internship, not for the work experience alone. (En 2 Dec 76)

A-DR1.9.1 Students who are on academic probation may not enroll in internship courses. (En 27 May 82)

Statement of Purpose and Effect:

This proposed amendment to the recorded variances of the Riverside Division for Systemwide Senate Regulation 780 is meant to bring the Division into compliance with Systemwide regulations (Bylaw 80.D. & 116F). Updating these records will allow the Riverside Division to accurately reflect current practices and operate within the bounds of the Academic Senate bylaws).

V. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Council

- **Steven W. Cheung, Chair**

1. Nomination and Election of the 2025-26 University Committee on Committees (UCOC) Vice Chair [ACTION]

In accordance with [Senate Bylaw 150.A.1](#) (Committees): “the members-at-large are to be named by the Assembly for two-year staggered terms. Each at-large member will serve as Vice Chair in the first year and shall normally succeed as Chair in the second year.” UCOC puts forward the candidacy of Anne McKnight, Professor of Comparative Literature/Japanese at UC Riverside.

CANDIDATE FOR 2025-26 UCOC VICE CHAIR

Anne McKnight

Comparative Literature/Japanese

UC Riverside

Website: <https://complitlang.ucr.edu/people/faculty/anne-mcknight/>

Anne McKnight researches and teaches modern and contemporary Japanese literature and film. Her publications include articles on feminist art, translation and activism; documentary film; and experimental films made in small studios; and the monographs *Nakagami Japan: Buraku and the Writing of Ethnicity* (U Minnesota Press, 2011), on a significant postwar writer, and *Long Take* (U Minnesota Press, December 2025), on the director Kurosawa Akira and his cinephilia.

Systemwide Service

University Committee on Committees, 2023-24

Division Service at UCR

Committee on Committees, 2021-24; Chair 2023-24

Departmental Service in Comparative Literature and Languages

Vice Chair, 2024~

Head of Japanese program 2019~

ACTION REQUESTED: The Assembly elects the 2025-26 UCOC vice chair.

VI. UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE REPORT

- **Juan Pablo Pardo- Guerra, Chair, University Committee on Faculty Welfare**

VII. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY SENIOR UNIVERSITY MANAGERS

- **Michael V. Drake, President**
- **Katherine S. Newman, Provost and Executive Vice President**
- **Nathan Brostrom, Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer**

VIII. Resolution on Use of Trellix and Similar Monitoring Software

Background: On May 23, 2025, the systemwide Academic Senate received a petition signed by 44 voting members of the Academic Senate, including 15 members of the Assembly, requesting that the Assembly convene a special meeting under [Senate Bylaw 110.A.3.c](#) to deliberate and vote on a resolution concerning the use of Trellix monitoring software on faculty and researcher computers. The petitioners also welcomed consideration of the resolution at the June 12, 2025 regular Assembly meeting. The resolution calls for the immediate suspension of Trellix and similar software, citing concerns about faculty privacy, academic freedom, and the lack of faculty consultation in the software’s deployment. The wording of the resolution is below.

The Assembly [discussed](#) the implementation of Trellix and other new cybersecurity measures at a February 13, 2025 special Assembly meeting. The Academic Council and the University Committee on Academic Computing and Communication (UCACC) [expressed concerns](#) about these mandates in June 2024. President Drake responded to these concerns in a [letter dated March 7, 2025](#).

Discussion format: Assembly members, other Senate attendees, and invited guests will have the opportunity to engage in Q&A, provide input, and share their perspectives. Assembly members will vote on the resolution.

ACTION REQUESTED: The Assembly considers approval of the resolution.

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, academic freedom, privacy, and autonomy are foundational principles upon which the integrity and excellence of scholarship, research, and teaching at the University of California depend;

WHEREAS, the deployment of Trellix monitoring software permits extensive surveillance capabilities, including scanning all accessed and executed files, logging detailed metadata (such as filenames, paths, alleged threat names, and hashes), quarantining files, and potentially uploading files deemed suspicious, thus severely compromising faculty privacy and autonomy;

WHEREAS, Trellix’s predecessor, FireEye, was hacked in 2020 in the SolarWinds cyberattack, which was determined by intelligence agencies to be carried out by Russian state-sponsored hackers and exposed over 250 federal agencies, including the Departments of State, Treasury, Commerce, Energy, and Homeland Security, as well as the National Institutes of Health;

WHEREAS, the data collected from faculty computers through Trellix software could become accessible to government agencies without a warrant, due to Trellix’s membership in the Joint Cyber Defense Collaborative—a joint task force comprising private companies and the federal Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Security Agency—that explicitly engages in “rapid bilateral and multilateral threat information sharing;”

WHEREAS, the unchecked capacity of such software to monitor, upload, and alter files without explicit consent poses a significant threat to intellectual freedom, confidentiality of sensitive research data, and the ethical standards expected within our scholarly community;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED, that the Assembly of the Academic Senate of the University of California, demands the immediate suspension of the implementation and use of Trellix or any similarly invasive monitoring software on faculty and researcher computer systems;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that any future monitoring software considered for deployment must undergo a transparent and inclusive evaluation process involving faculty representation to ensure the safeguarding of privacy, academic freedom, and research integrity.

- X. **REPORTS ON SPECIAL COMMITTEES [None]**
- XI. **PETITIONS OF STUDENTS [None]**
- XII. **NEW BUSINESS**