



ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

June 12, 2025

Minutes of Meeting

I. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

Pursuant to the call, the Assembly of the Academic Senate met on Thursday, June 12, 2025. Academic Senate Chair Steven W. Cheung presided and called the meeting to order at 2:00 pm. Senate Executive Director Monica Lin called the roll of Assembly members and confirmed a quorum. Attendance is listed in Appendix A of these minutes.

II. MINUTES

ACTION: The Assembly approved the minutes of April 23, 2025.

III. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Chair Cheung acknowledged Professor Walter Leal for deferring a continuing business item to allow time for discussion of a resolution on the use of Trellix and similar monitoring software. Professor Leal moved to change the agenda to discuss the Trellix resolution earlier, citing urgency of the topic. He emphasized that this change would not interfere with the scheduled remarks by the president and senior leadership.

Parliamentarian Yang clarified that such a change requires a two-thirds majority vote. Professor Leal reiterated the time-sensitive nature of the resolution. Chair Cheung noted that moving the resolution earlier would deprive the Assembly from hearing administrative perspectives on the issue, although he acknowledged that their presence was not required.

ACTION: The vote to modify the agenda was 20 members in favor and 15 against. There were 9 abstentions. The motion failed to meet the required threshold, and the original agenda remained in place.

IV. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY SENATE LEADERSHIP

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

Assembly Apportionment of 2025-26 Assembly: The apportionment of Assembly representatives for the 2025-26 academic year was enclosed in the agenda. Campus representation did not change compared to 2024-25.

Senior Leadership Appointments: On May 2, 2025, the Regents appointed James B. Milliken as the 22nd UC president. He currently serves as chancellor of the University of Texas system and has previously led the City University of New York and the University of Nebraska. He will begin work on August 1. Jack Hu will begin as UC Riverside chancellor on July 15, and Monica Varsanyi will start as vice provost for faculty affairs and academic programs on June 16.

Budget: The governor's May budget revision proposal included a smaller than expected 3% cut to UC and the restoration of \$125 million from a prior reduction, resulting in a nearly flat UC budget for fiscal year 2025-26. The Regents approved a pause on a scheduled 0.5% employer contribution increase to the UC Retirement Plan (UCRP) and the suspension of an \$800 million transfer to UCRP from STIP, freeing up liquidity for the campuses.

Proposed Climate Change Committee: The Academic Council has approved circulating for systemwide Senate review a proposal from the San Diego and San Francisco divisions for a new systemwide Senate committee on climate change and sustainability.

Common Academic Calendar: Senate [feedback](#) on the [draft report](#) of the Academic Planning Council's Systemwide Academic Calendar Workgroup reflected overwhelming opposition to the University pursuing a systemwide academic calendar change due to the high financial and workload costs of a transition and a strong desire to maintain current calendar systems. The Senate's comments will be shared with the workgroup, whose final report will be submitted in July 2025.

Faculty Discipline: In May 2025, the Regents discussed the report and recommendations of the Joint Senate-Administration Workgroup on Faculty Discipline. The report proposes: 1) calibration guidelines for disciplinary actions involving expressive activities that align timelines with those for sexual violence/sexual harassment and abusive conduct policies; 2) a systemwide Privilege and Tenure network to assist local divisions that cannot assemble a hearing panel within the required 14-day period; 3) filing of disciplinary charges with a range of potential sanctions by chancellors; 4) enhanced case-tracking and reporting; and 5) required annual reports from chancellors. A 90-day systemwide Senate review of the report and proposed changes to the APM will begin in the fall.

UCAD: The Academic Council's UC Adaptation to Disruptions (UCAD) Task Force has been meeting weekly since mid-April to discuss a range of emerging threats and issues. UCAD plans to present an interim report to the Academic Council in July 2025.

V. SPECIAL ORDERS

A. Consent Calendar

- 1. UCLA Variances to Senate Regulation 780**
- 2. UCR Variance to Senate Regulation 780**

The consent calendar included two approved variances to Senate Regulation 780, one from UCLA and one from UCR. The UCLA variance updates grievance procedures and bylaws; the UCR variance codifies existing grading practices to align with Senate bylaws.

ACTION: The Assembly approved the consent calendar.

VI. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Council [ACTION]

- **Steven W. Cheung, Chair**

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

ACTION: The Assembly elected Professor Anne McKnight (UCR) 2025-26 UCOC Vice Chair by unanimous consent.

VII. UNIVERSITY AND FACULTY WELFARE REPORT

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

The report was delivered electronically following the meeting. See Appendix B.

VIII. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY SENIOR UNIVERSITY MANAGERS

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

Federal Challenges: President Drake reflected on his final meeting with the Assembly, noting the immense challenges the University has faced during his tenure and emphasizing the current federal challenges. He lamented the current political climate and expressed concern about the chilling effect law enforcement presence has had on campus events and student participation. He encouraged faculty to continue offering flexibility and support for students affected by visa revocations and safety concerns. He highlighted that 157 of 159 UC students whose visas were recently revoked had them reinstated, and credited faculty and legal teams for their support. Despite ongoing legal and political challenges, he affirmed UC's commitment to truth, academic freedom, and its core mission.

Leadership Transitions: President Drake praised incoming UC President J.B. Milliken and UCR Chancellor-designate Jack Hu, noting their strong backgrounds in public higher education. He also praised outgoing UCR Chancellor Wilcox for his leadership, including campus achievements like American Association of Universities (AAU) membership and medical school expansion.

Budget Issues: President Drake outlined progress from a proposed 8% cut to a now-likely flat budget, thanks to support from the governor and Legislature. He stressed that UC's continued excellence in education, research, and healthcare justifies this investment.

Chief Financial Officer (CFO) Brostrom confirmed that the current legislative budget proposal would retain a 3% cut (\$130 million) proposed in the governor's May revision and restore \$125 million from a prior deferral, leaving UC with a flat budget for 2025-26. The 3% cut would be restored in July 2026. UC's 2025-26 Compact budget increase of \$240 million would also be deferred, with a partial payment of \$96 million in 2026-27 and the remaining \$144 million in 2028-29. He added that UC's tuition stability plan (cohort tuition model) has provided substantial benefits, including \$500 million in added campus funding and lower student self-help costs. The CFO plans to propose a renewal to the plan with adjustments that better account for inflation.

He concluded by expressing cautious optimism about the budget outlook, reaffirming UC's commitment to affordability, research excellence, and long-term financial sustainability.

Research Funding: Provost Newman described efforts to develop a California-based research funding model that blends public investment, philanthropy, and private sector support to help offset declining federal research funding. She acknowledged the work of the Senate's UC Adaptation to Disruptions Task Force (UCAD) and suggested forming a broader policy group, including both faculty and administrators to address federal policy changes and potential funding retrenchments.

Global Language Network Pilot: Provost Newman reported that she is collaborating with humanities deans on a systemwide Global Language Network pilot program, which would expand access to less commonly taught languages by offering them online across UC campuses. She stressed the need for Senate input on credit recognition and general education alignment, and emphasized that the program must be built around strong quality metrics for online instruction.

Degree Plus Pilot: She also described a new “Degree Plus” program being piloted at UCSB and UCSD. This initiative allows undergraduates to earn UC Extension certificates focused on labor market needs alongside their degrees, often paired with paid internships. The goal is to improve career readiness without significantly extending time to degree.

Academic Freedom Congress: Provost Newman praised the recent Systemwide Congress on Academic Freedom, co-sponsored by the Senate, for its high-quality presentations and relevance during this challenging time.

Discussion highlights:

- President Drake responded to concerns from Assembly members about the federal government's proposed 15% cap on indirect cost recovery rates (i.e., Facilities and Administrative, or F&A costs). He expressed optimism that a more reasonable outcome would emerge from ongoing bipartisan negotiations and emphasized that Congress recognizes the essential costs associated with research.
- CFO Brostrom described two potential models under consideration for indirect cost recovery: one that applies a simplified flat rate and another based on the Gates Foundation's structure, which would shift more costs into direct grant funding. He stressed the importance of monitoring Medicare and MediCal policy changes, as UC medical centers receive \$10 billion annually through these programs.
- In response to questions about deferred cuts and the spreading of future increases over multiple years, President Drake acknowledged the concerns but reiterated his belief that the governor and Legislature view UC as a strong partner and remain committed to supporting it, even amid budget constraints.
- In response to faculty questions, Provost Newman acknowledged that philanthropic and state-led models may face overhead constraints, but emphasized UC's determination to support faculty through innovation and strategic partnerships.

IX. RESOLUTION ON USE OF TRELLIX AND SIMILAR MONITORING SOFTWARE

Chair Cheung introduced a resolution calling for the immediate suspension of Trellix and similar endpoint detection and response (EDR) software on faculty and researcher computer systems. The resolution cites concerns about academic freedom, faculty privacy, and the absence of meaningful faculty consultation in the decision to deploy the software. It asks that any future deployment of monitoring software follow a transparent and inclusive evaluation process involving faculty. Chair Cheung reminded Assembly members that the topic was previously discussed at a special Assembly meeting in February 2025 and acknowledged ongoing concerns expressed by the Academic Council and the systemwide Senate Committee on Academic Computing and Communications (UCACC).

Professor Kevork Abazajian, the resolution's lead proposer, argued that Trellix EDR software grants itself unrestricted, root-level access to faculty devices, enabling the monitoring, extraction, alteration, or deletion of files without faculty consent or notification. He warned that such access constitutes an unprecedented intrusion into faculty autonomy, threatening privacy, academic freedom, and the intellectual security essential to UC's teaching and research missions. He noted that UCI, UCSB, and UCD had already adopted resolutions calling for a halt to Trellix, and that UC Berkeley's Academic Senate had also expressed concerns.

He further argued that Trellix's participation in the federal Joint Cyber Defense Collaborative raises the risk of warrantless surveillance and government overreach. He emphasized that less invasive

alternatives exist, such as remote browser isolation technologies, and could protect UC systems without compromising privacy. He concluded by urging Assembly members to vote in favor of the resolution as a reaffirmation of UC's commitment to academic freedom and data security.

UC Vice President for Information Technology Van Williams explained that the decision to deploy Trellix followed a significant increase in cyberattacks targeting UC since 2015, resulting in the loss of personal data, protected health information, and unrecoverable faculty research. He emphasized that EDR software is now a requirement for cyber insurance coverage and is expected by credit agencies. He noted that UCOP has worked with the Senate over the years on cybersecurity strategy and that faculty input has already influenced the development of updated accountability mechanisms. He understood that President Drake is aware of faculty concerns and campus resolutions, but the president believes the use of Trellix is necessary to protect the institution.

Discussion highlights:

- A member asked why the University could not use alternative software that provides similar protections without infringing on privacy. Vice President Williams responded that Trellix was selected through a vetting process and is currently used across the UC system, but that a working group with faculty representatives is already evaluating next-generation alternatives.
- A member asked the resolution's authors what the practical consequences of suspending Trellix would be and whether there was a consensus on an alternative. Professor Abazajian responded that faculty had long operated securely without Trellix and that a brief transition period would not significantly increase risk. He emphasized that the resolution was a call for a better, less intrusive solution rather than an abandonment of cybersecurity tools.
- A Senate member argued against the resolution, stating that UCOP had taken steps to respect academic freedom and privacy through formal policies such as the [Electronic Information Security Policy](#) (IS-3). He suggested that local campus leadership, rather than UCOP, have primary responsibility for the breakdown in faculty consultation and communication.
- Another Senate member criticized the lack of a formal analysis weighing cybersecurity benefits against privacy risks. A cybersecurity expert and former UCACC chair argued for continued use of Trellix with stronger safeguards. He recommended technical controls to limit surveillance, audit logs of administrative actions, faculty access to those logs, and public transparency reports.
- Several faculty members criticized UCOP for poor communication and a top-down approach. One warned of the risks of relying on a private vendor like Trellix that may be compelled to cooperate with federal agencies in ways that threaten academic freedom.
- A member raised concerns about the impact of the mandate on faculty who use personal computers for work, noting that UC faculty are not issued institutional laptops and may be forced to bear personal costs to comply.
- Others expressed support for faculty oversight and accountability but opposed the call to suspend Trellix immediately. A member asked why an opt-out mechanism could not be provided; Vice President Williams responded that allowing individual opt-outs would expose the broader system to risk, as compromised machines could endanger shared networks.
- Finally, UCACC Chair Jenson Wong stated that the committee did not take a formal position on the resolution but understands the need for improved communication and partnership between the Senate and administration on cybersecurity matters.

ACTION: The resolution passed with 27 votes in favor, 6 opposed, and 14 abstentions, amounting to 82% approval among 33 voting members.

X. REPORTS ON SPECIAL COMMITTEES [NONE]

XI. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS [NONE]

XII. NEW BUSINESS [NONE]

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 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 June 12, 2025

Appendix B – UC Faculty Welfare 2024–25 Report

**Appendix A – 2024-2025 Assembly Attendance Record
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
Dan Potter, UCD Vice Chair (alt for Katheryn Russ, Chair)
Valerie Jenness, Chair, UCI
Megan McEvoy, UCLA Vice Chair (alt for Kathleen Bawn, Chair)
Kevin Mitchell, Chair, UCM
Kenneth Barrish, Chair, UCR
Olivia Graeve, Chair, UCSD
Errol Lobo, UCSF Vice Chair (alt for Steven Hetts, Chair)
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
Catherine Sugar, UCEP Vice Chair (alt for Rachael Goodhue, Chair)
Juan Pablo Pardo-Guerra, Chair, UCFW (absent)
(James Weatherall, UCORP vice chair (Susanne Nicholas Chair)
Tim Groeling, Chair, UCPB

Berkeley (5)

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

Davis (6)

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

Irvine (4)

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

Los Angeles (7)

Christopher Colwell (absent)
Mekonnen Gebremichael (absent)
Ronald D. Hays
Vivek Shetty (alt for 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 (absent)
Sabine Fruhstuck (absent)
Charles Jones (absent)

Santa Cruz (2)

Melissa Caldwell
Rita Mehta

Secretary/Parliamentarian

Katherine Yang (UCSF)

UC Faculty Welfare 2024-25

Report to the Assembly



Jill Hollenbach
TFIR Chair, UCSF



Juan Pablo Pardo-Guerra
UC San Diego
Chair



Karen Bales
UC Davis
Vice Chair



Vickie Mays
HCTF Chair, UCLA



Nancy Wallace
UC Berkeley



J Keith Gilles
UC Berkeley (alt)



Janet Foley
UC Davis



Lisa Naugle
UC Irvine



Ben Lourie
UC Irvine (alt)



Justin Caram
UCLA



Jayson Beaster-Jones
UC Merced



Salman Asif
UC Riverside



Amy Adler
UC San Diego



John Saucedo
UCSF

Laurie Freeman
UC Santa Barbara



Yat Li
UC Santa Cruz



Ken Feer,
Senate Analyst

The year 2024-25 was marked by numerous challenges to the welfare of faculty at the University of California. In addition to the growing cost pressures on the medical plans offered by the University, we have confronted an unprecedented series of disruptions to our teaching, research, and academic freedom. This has taken place in the context of a particularly demanding year during which the University initiated a comprehensive review of benefits and compensation through both the Benefits Study (Benefits) and the Total Remuneration Study (Total Rem). Below, I briefly describe how UC Faculty Welfare engaged with these various challenges.

1. Medical plans

One of the most prominent issues faced by faculty and other employees of the university over the last years is the rapid increase in health insurance premiums across all plans offered by the university. Consistent increases in the 8-12% range generated justified concern about the state of one of our most important benefits. This was made evident by the active participation of faculty in a recent special Assembly of the Senate.

UCFW is both a representative and an expert body. While the main committee includes delegates from all the divisions, its two ad hoc sub-committees—the Health Care Task Force (HCTF)¹ and the Task Force on Investments and Retirement (TFIR)²—include faculty experts that have both a strong grasp of key technical issues (rate setting processes for medical plans, for example) and a detailed understanding of the operations of the University of California. In matters of benefits, the Academic Senate engages with the administration through both its representative and expert functions. This has certainly been the case regarding discussions of our medical benefits.

Specifically, for the past year and building on the work initiated by past Chair John Hearty in 2023-24, HCTF is working with Human Resources to establish better channels of communication and participation with faculty to reduce the uncertainty around the state of our plans and increase our voice and input in their design and yearly recalibration. The Senate has traditionally contributed much to the design of

¹ Chaired by Vickie Mays (UCLA). <https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/committees/hctf/index.html>

² Chaired by Jill Hollenbach (UCSF). <https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/committees/tfir/index.html>

our medical benefits—pay bands, for example, were a Senate initiative—and this continues today. HCTF is actively involved in conversations about redesigning our health benefits to make them both less volatile across years and more sustainable. Most recently, this has been accomplished through HCTF’s participation in the assessment of our medical plans that is part of the annual premiums-setting process.

While there has been a productive conversation between the Academic Senate through UCFW and its sub-committees and the administration, solving some of the problems of our medical benefits is a complex, multi-year process with real limits to what is possible. The escalating cost of health care is a widespread problem affecting similar organizations in our state and country. The increases that we have seen to our premiums are not outliers, for example, and compare to those seen in the plans offered by other large public employers (particularly CalPERS). Addressing the challenge of escalating costs will require various, complex steps and decisions. Our most effective means for protecting faculty interests is to continue working with Human Resources through our expert and deliberative functions to achieve a medical benefits portfolio that is both financially sustainable and responsive to faculty needs.

2. Dental insurance

A perennial issue under discussion at UC Faculty Welfare is the declining quality of our dental benefits. Following the pandemic, the main benefit offered by the University through Delta Dental has become less reliable and useful—given its lower reimbursement rates, practices in some high-cost markets have dropped Delta Dental, leading to a benefit that is of little use to some employees.

Following conversations with Human Resources, UCOP initiated the process of contracting a new dental benefits provider. UC Faculty Welfare and its HCTF are involved in the process to contribute both expertise and user perspectives.

3. Retirement contributions

Along with medical, retirement benefits are central to our welfare. Through its Task Force on Investment and Retirement, TFIR, UC Faculty Welfare communicates with

the offices of Chief Financial Officer Nathan Brostrom and Chief Investment Officer Jagdeep Singh Bachher to assess the health of University of California Retirement Plan (UCRP) and other institutional investments—including the different investment pools of the University of California.

In the space of retirement, TFIR worked on two notable fronts. The first concerns changing the default retirement choice for new employees from Pension to Savings. Currently, new employees of the University are defaulted into the 2016 Pension plan, having the ability to switch to a defined contribution savings plan on their fifth year with the university, when they can also become vested into the defined benefits UCRP.

Quantitative work by members of TFIR shows that this approach does not reflect the interests of most employees, a considerable number of which often work at the university for less than 5 years. For these employees, being defaulted into Pension choice means that, without making an active choice during onboarding and upon leaving the university, they lose their employer contributions to retirement (these remain with UCRP upon separation prior to vesting). Changing the default to Savings (a 401k-style account) would prevent this issue without affecting employee interests or the overall health of the pension fund.

For the past years, UCFW and TFIR have worked with UCOP to effectuate this change, but it remains pending. We are looking forward to continuing to work with the administration to implement this welfare-enhancing measure.

The second front where TFIR placed efforts involved rethinking the university's pension contribution strategies for this year in the context of the financial challenges our campuses face because of the new national higher education funding landscape. Given the overall health of UCRP, TFIR advocated a one-year pause to the increase in the employer's contribution to retirement (scheduled for 0.5%) as well as a pause in the loans from the university's Short Term Investment Pool (STIP) to UCRP—part of a multi-year strategy that seeks to reduce the fund's liabilities. TFIR also advocated increasing the expected rate of return of UCRP to reflect long term historical returns. These three proposals can contribute much needed liquidity to the system at a time when divisions are facing considerable financial constraints. A UCFW/TFIR request to the Office of the President on these issues was endorsed by Academic Council and conveyed to the administration.

4. Mortgage Origination Program

The Mortgage Origination Program (MOP) is, without a doubt, one of our institution's most critical instruments for recruiting and retaining internationally leading faculty. Specifically, it provides a mechanism for faculty to access a cost-effective mortgage that is often the only viable means for purchasing a house in California's high-priced real estate market.

The rapid surge in housing costs since the pandemic, and the recent rise in interest rates, increased demand for MOP loans tremendously. During some times, MOP's interest rate was slightly less than half that of the average commercially available mortgage, making it a uniquely attractive program. This clearly accelerated uptake: the last two years have seen volumes of loans that eclipse those of years past. With such demand, MOP funds were quickly depleted.

Throughout the first half of 2024-25, TFIR and UCFW advocated greater funding levels for MOP as well as a potential program redesign. While the second issue is still pending, the office of CFO Brostrom identified \$100M that could serve as bridge funding for the MOP program for the remainder of the year. UCFW is looking forward to continuing to work with CFO Brostrom and UCOP in redesigning MOP to meet the needs of faculty.

5. Benefits Survey

During 2024-25, UC undertook an ambitious review of the UC experience in the form of four employee-focused studies—the Staff Engagement Survey, Staff Exit Survey, Benefits Survey, and Total Remuneration Study.

In particular, the Benefits Study seeks to collect and assess employee feedback about existing benefits offered by the University of California. Given that benefits redesign directly affects faculty, UCFW has vocally advocated participating in the process.

As a result of UCFW and Senate advocacy over the 2023-25 period, three faculty members were invited to work with the selected vendor (Deloitte) that implemented the Benefits Survey in designing the instrument. Two former Senate chairs, Susan Cochran and Shane White, along with HCTF member Nadereh Pourat, contributed to the design of the survey throughout the first half of the 2024-25 academic year.

Given the importance of this exercise, UCFW advocates and expects continued involvement in the analysis of the results.

6. Total Remuneration Study

As in 2014 and 2009, UCOP is conducting an extensive review of employee remuneration at the university with the objective of assessing our competitiveness with respect to the 8 institutions³ historically used as our benchmark for comparisons. This Total Remuneration study seeks to capture both cash compensation (salaries) and the value attributed to our active and retiree benefits.

Unlike previous years, the 2025 Total Remuneration Study faces a new series of difficulties. Data about our comparators is now less available—disaggregated data from other institutions is no longer accessible due to legal restrictions on data sharing. Added to this is the greater complexity of our benefits: the addition of a 2016 UCRP tier and a Second Choice option increased the complexity of calculations of the value of benefits for UC employees. A push to refocus the analysis on comparisons with a larger set of institutions (the AAU universities excluding Canadian institutions) further complicated the design and viability of the study.

In safeguarding the integrity of the Total Remuneration Study, UCFW advocated strong faculty participation in the design of the methods that will be used to estimate employee remuneration. Every estimation of the ‘actual’ value of employee remuneration is invariably the result of a model (e.g. in assigning a cost to the pension benefit at a certain age and service credit). Some models are better and more useful than others. UCFW maintains the position that whatever models and estimates inform the analysis of total remuneration should both reflect the particularities of our institution and its employees and the approaches of previous studies. Guaranteeing comparability with the 2014 and 2009 studies, for example, requires preserving a focus on our comp 8. Similarly, estimating the value of benefits requires nuance understanding of their use by faculty and staff.

³ Harvard University, MIT, Stanford University, Yale University, SUNY Buffalo, University of Illinois Urbana, University of Michigan Ann Arbor, University of Virginia.

In the interest of making the Total Remuneration study an acceptable analysis of UC employees, UCFW nominated four faculty experts to serve on the Total Remuneration Advisory Committee (TRAC): Jim Chalfant, Dan Hare, Mark Peterson, and Ben Handel. This group includes experts that participated in previous iterations of the Total Remuneration study as well as new participants. It also captures the range of expertise on retirement and health care from TFIR and HCTF respectively.

As the work of the TRAC continues, UCFW is constantly evaluating developments, including divergences in modelling approaches between faculty and the consultants employed to implement the study. Our objective is to find common ground that will incorporate the expert views of our faculty in a study that accurately captures employee remuneration in relation to that of our comparator institutions and, in the process, the overall competitiveness of our salaries and benefits. This study will continue well into the 2025-26 academic year.

7. Senate Service Recognition

The word ‘expert’ is used frequently in this document for one key reason: in addition to being a mechanism for institutional governance, the Academic Senate reflects the breadth and depth of faculty experience and expertise. Through their participation in Senate committees and ad hoc task forces—both divisional and systemwide—faculty provide unremunerated advisory work ranging from legal and policy analyses to the design of complex surveys and valuation models. For some committees and some taskforces, faculty invest considerable amounts of time.

As a body populated by volunteers, the Academic Senate thrives when incentives for participation are strong and clear. For many, participating of the Academic Senate either as representatives at the Assembly or members of committees and task forces is a vocational calling—part of the expected work that we owe our institution. And yet, as many colleagues have remarked informally, this work is largely invisible and, to a degree, unrecognized.

Throughout this academic year, UCFW discussed this issue as one of faculty welfare: unrecognized or undervalued work is detrimental to our experience as faculty; senate service is one such example. In addressing this issue, UCFW created a simple toolkit that seeks to signal the importance of the contributions of faculty to our Senate and university. Specifically, the toolkit consists of a certificate that can be provided to faculty at the completion of their yearly service that contains

language about the time commitment that such service involved. In addition to this, a two-page document offers specific suggestions on how Senate service can be highlighted in personal statements and department letters that feed into the merit and promotion process. An admittedly small step, this toolkit—which will be shared over the summer in anticipation of the 2025-26 academic year—seeks to remedy some of the invisibility of the work and expert contributions that are essential to our institution.

The above is far from an exhaustive list of that topics discussed by UCFW throughout the year. To these, we may add substantive discussions around

- o the continuing effects of the still relatively new graduate student contract,
- o ongoing reviews of the performance of the Retirement Administration Service Center,
- o the implementation of new legislative mandates around the disclosure of substantiated findings of misconduct during hiring,
- o the implementation of new legislative requirements for letters of recommendation,
- o new onerous requirements for faculty recalled shortly after retiring,
- o the effects of budget cuts on faculty morale, workloads, and working conditions,
- o the implementation of Trelix and systemwide policies on cybersecurity,
- o rising hate speech against faculty in student evaluations,
- o problems related to affordable childcare and housing access.

Faculty welfare touches upon all aspects of our work, from benefits and workloads to our experiences in research, teaching, and service. As our university is forced into a new, challenging, and uncertain landscape for higher education, the work of this committee will become ever more critical. Sustaining the goodwill and contributions of faculty to the Senate, both in the divisional and systemwide faculty welfare committees as well as through their participation in specialist task forces that offer constructive criticisms and solutions to the administration, will be essential for preserving faculty voice and protecting its interests at a critical juncture of our university's history. If the experience of 2024-25 can be used as a benchmark, however, I am confident this committee will continue to serve the Senate and its faculty through its continued dedication, proactive interest, and breadth of expertise.

Juan Pablo Pardo-Guerra
Chair, UC Faculty Welfare