



**ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE  
November 20, 2025  
Minutes of Special Meeting**

**I. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS**

Pursuant to the call, the Assembly of the Academic Senate met on Thursday, November 20, 2025. Academic Senate Chair Ahmet Palazoglu presided and called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm. Senate Executive Director Monica Lin called the roll of Assembly members and confirmed a quorum. Attendance is listed in Appendix A of these minutes.

**II. RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE DISCLOSURE OF NAMES OF FACULTY, STUDENTS, AND STAFF TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT**

Chair Palazoglu convened the special meeting pursuant to [Senate Bylaw 110.A.3.C](#), explaining that the meeting was called by a petition signed by more than 25 Senate members. He noted that a special meeting may consider only the item stated in the petition unless new business is added by unanimous consent. He reviewed procedures: the Assembly follows the Standard Code of Parliamentary Procedure with the Parliamentarian's assistance; only Assembly members may make motions or vote; and speakers should keep comments to one minute.

Chair Palazoglu summarized the background. The petition requested an Assembly discussion and vote on a resolution concerning UC's disclosure of names from UCLA, UCSB, UCSD, UCD, and UCSC in federal investigations to the U.S. Department of Education's Office for Civil Rights (OCR). On October 27, 2025 the Academic Council issued a [statement](#) raising concerns about privacy protections, transparency, and shared governance related to the disclosure at UCB. President Milliken [responded](#) to the Council's statement on November 13. UC Legal reviewed the petitioners' original resolution, and that review was shared with the petitioners and Assembly members. The petitioners submitted a substantially revised version of the resolution approximately one hour before the special meeting, and the amended text was provided to Assembly members by email and posted in the Zoom meeting chat. Chair Palazoglu then invited a motion to begin discussion.

Deputy General Counsel Allison Woodall was present to answer legal questions.

Professor Walter Leal, speaking for the petitioners, explained that the amended version incorporated feedback from UC Legal, removed language that could be interpreted as criticizing the current UC administration, and added an explicit endorsement of the Academic Council's October 27 statement.

***Discussion highlights***

- Faculty asked procedural questions, including whether the University Committee on Academic Freedom had reviewed the resolution (it had not), and sought clarification from UC Legal on the voluntary resolution agreement with the OCR and UC's disclosure practices.
- Deputy General Counsel Woodall reiterated that no personally identifiable information (PII) was disclosed under the voluntary resolution agreement covering UCLA, UCSB, UCSD, UCD, and

UCSC. As a condition of the voluntary resolution agreement with OCR, UC submitted a spreadsheet of Title VI complaints, with all PII redacted. UC Berkeley's release of unredacted records occurred under a separate, later federal investigation, and Berkeley is the only UC campus that has released unredacted information to OCR. She also explained that notification requirements differ depending on the type of federal request, such as a subpoena versus other forms of inquiry.

### **Comments in Support of the Resolution**

Faculty speaking in support emphasized:

- The importance of a unified, systemwide faculty voice to defend academic freedom, privacy, and due process, particularly for students and scholars who may fear retaliation or deportation. An Assembly endorsement would also reinforce the Academic Council's statement.
- A lack of Senate consultation before UCOP entered into the voluntary resolution agreement, before Berkeley released PII, and throughout subsequent developments. Several described the events as a failure of shared governance requiring greater transparency.
- Concerns that UC's actions and limited communication with UC community members could deter individuals from filing civil rights complaints or participating in protected speech, protest, and academic activities, especially among vulnerable groups.
- The broader political context, including concerns that Title VI investigations are being used as political tools rather than genuine civil rights protections, and that UC should more forcefully resist federal actions that undermine academic freedom.
- The uneven disclosure practices across campuses, and the associated risks of doxxing, harassment, and other forms of targeting.

### **Questions and Concerns About Specific Language**

Several faculty members raised concerns about the phrasing of particular resolves:

- The phrase "until all legal processes have run their course" was viewed as ambiguous and potentially limiting.
- Some argued that the resolution should include more concrete commitments, such as safety resources, legal support, and clearer limits on information sharing, as was the case in the related Academic Council statement.
- Others questioned the relationship between the amended resolution and the Council's statement, asking whether the resolution duplicated or weakened the Council's stronger statement.

### **Additional Comments and Concerns**

Some faculty raised additional cautionary points:

- Some argued that the resolution did not fully address the risk of identification even when PII is redacted and sought clarification from UC Legal about the granularity of the complaint data that was withheld.
- Others suggested that the Assembly avoid framing UCOP as adversarial and instead recognize areas of alignment with the administration and questioned whether portions of the "be it further resolved" clauses diluted the strength of the Academic Council's statement.
- Several faculty members called for stronger systemwide standards and protective measures.

### **Debate Over an Amendment**

Late in the meeting, an Assembly member proposed an amendment to end the resolution after the paragraph endorsing the Academic Council's statement, removing all subsequent resolves.

Supporters contended that the additional clauses were vague or repetitive. Opponents argued that the omitted sections were necessary because they addressed due process rights, timely notification, and the use of personal information in federal negotiations.

Before the amendment was formally proposed, the mover of the resolution called the question to close debate. Chair Palazoglu explained that a motion to close debate takes precedence and requires a two-thirds vote. A point of order was raised about whether the Assembly should vote on closing debate before hearing the amendment. The mover then withdrew the motion to close debate in order to allow the amendment to be stated. The amendment was then formally offered but not accepted by the petitioners. This was followed by a point of order clarifying that any amendment to the resolution must be approved by the Assembly either by general consent or majority vote.

**Motion to Postpone: With time nearly expired and unresolved disagreement over the amendment and final language, a motion was made to postpone consideration. By roll call vote (46 in favor, 3 against), the Assembly agreed to postpone discussion and action on the resolution to the January 15, 2026 Assembly meeting.**

### **III. NEW BUSINESS**

*None.*

The meeting adjourned at 4:05 pm

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

Attest: Ahmet Palazoglu, Academic Senate Chair

Attachments: Appendix A – Assembly Attendance Record, Meeting of November 20, 2025

**Appendix A – 2025-2026 Assembly Attendance Record  
Special Meeting of November 20, 2025**

**President of the University:**

James B. Milliken (absent)

**Academic Council Members:**

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

**Berkeley (5)**

Thomas Philip (alt for Doris Bachtrog)  
Ronald Cohen (alt for Chris Hoofnagle)  
Jelani Nelson (alt for Hannah Ginsborg)  
Tyrone Hayes  
Daniel Sargent

**Davis (6)**

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

**Irvine (4)**

Yousef Al-Bulushi  
German Andres Enciso (absent)  
Oliver Eng  
Veronica Vieira

**Los Angeles (7)**

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

**Merced (1)**

Sidra Goldman-Mellor (alt for Shilpa Khatri)

**Riverside (2)**

Marcus Kaul  
Manuela Martins-Green

**San Diego (5)**

Marianna Alperin  
Christina Gremel  
Randy Hampton (absent)  
Britta Larsen (absent)  
Julia Ortony

**San Francisco (5)**

Melike Pekmezci (alt for Ana Delgado)  
Jennifer James  
Stuart Gansky (alt for Leigh Kimberg)  
Tracy Lin (alt for Kewchang Lee)  
Margaret Wallhagen

**Santa Barbara (3)**

Eileen Boris  
Christopher Kruegel  
Lisa Parks

**Santa Cruz (2)**

Melissa Caldwell  
Roger Schoenman

**Secretary/Parliamentarian**

Katherine Yang (UCSF)