



Assembly of the Academic Senate
Notice of Meeting
Thursday, October 8, 2026
2:00 pm – 4:30 pm

AGENDA

[Assembly members](#) are pre-registered and receive unique Zoom links for the meeting.

Other UC Academic Senate members who wish to attend must register at:

https://UCOP.zoom.us/meeting/register/TQc2bL-ATYypj_LIAHZZJA

Item	Enclosures
I. Roll Call of Members (2:00 - 2:10 pm)	Page 3
II. Minutes [Action] 1. Approval of Minutes of the Meeting of June 11, 2026 2. Appendix A: Assembly Attendance, June 11, 2026	Pages 4-9 Page 10
III. Announcements by the Chair (2:10 - 2:40 pm) ▪ Susannah Scott, Assembly Chair	
IV. Reports of Standing Committees (2:40 - 3:00 pm) A. Academic Council ▪ Susannah Scott, Council Chair 1. Proposed Revisions of Senate Bylaws 334 and 335 [Action]	Pages 11-16
V. Announcements by Senior Executive Leadership (3:00 - 4:00 pm) ▪ James B. Milliken, President ▪ Ralph Hexter, Interim Provost and Executive Vice President ▪ Nathan Brostrom, Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer	
VI. Reports of Standing Committees, Continued (4:00 – 4:30) A. Academic Council ▪ Susannah Scott, Council Chair 1. Academic Council Charges to BOARS on Standardized Testing and the A-G Framework	
VII. Special Orders A. Consent Calendar [NONE] B. Annual Reports [2025-26] - Academic Council - Academic Computing and Communications (UCACC) - Academic Council Special Committee on Laboratory Issues (ACSCOLI) - Academic Freedom (UCAF) - Academic Personnel (UCAP) - Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) - Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA) - Committees (UCOC)	Pages 18-86

Diversity and Equity (UCODE)
Educational Policy (UCEP)
Faculty Welfare (UCFW)
International Education (UCIE)
Library and Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC)
Planning and Budget (UCPB)
Preparatory Education (UCOPE)
Privilege and Tenure (UCPT)
Research Policy (UCORP)
Rules and Jurisdiction (UCRJ)

- VIII. University and Faculty Welfare Report [NONE]**
- IX. Reports of Special Committees [NONE]**
- X. Petitions of Students [NONE]**
- XI. New Business**

I. Roll Call

2026-27 Assembly Roll Call – Meeting of October 8, 2026

President of the University:

James B. Milliken

Academic Council Members:

Susannah Scott, Chair
Amani Nuru-Jeter, Vice Chair
Thomas Philip, Chair, UCB
Daniel Potter, Chair, UCD
Lisa Grant Ludwig, Chair, UCI
Time Groeling, Chair, UCLA
Courtenay Monroe, Chair, UCM
Kenneth Barish, Chair, UCR
Akos Rona-Tas, Chair, UCSD
Errol Lobo, Chair, UCSF
Rita Raley, Chair, UCSB
Melissa Caldwell, Chair, UCSC
David Volz, BOARS Chair
Elenora Grandi, CCGA Chair
Gareth Funning, UCAADE Chair
Angela Gelli, UCAP Chair
Jason Duque, UCEP Chair
Alexander Sher, UCFW Chair
James Weatherall, UCORP Chair
Alyssa Brewer, UCPB Chair

Berkeley (5)

Doris Bachtrog
Sharad Chari
Keith Feldman
Chris Hoofnagle
Ann Keller

Davis (6)

Linda Bisson
Rachael Goodhue
Walter Leal
Richard McKenney
Sanjai Parikh
Erkin Seker

Irvine (4)

Matthew Foreman
Kristen Hatch
Veronica Vieira
Vacant (1)

Los Angeles (7)

Corey Arnold
Joseph Bristow
Christopher Colwell
Ariel Gross
Randall Kuhn
Anna Barbara Moscicki
Robert Zeithammer

Merced (1)

Sidra Goldman-Mellor

Riverside (2)

Harry Tom
Marcus Kaul

San Diego (5)

Christina Gremel
Eric Halgren
Randy Hampton
Britta Larsen
Shahrokh Yadegari

San Francisco (5)

Ana Delgado
Jennifer James
Leigh Kimberg
Melike Pekmezci
Margaret Wallhagen

Santa Barbara (3)

Charles Akemann
Peter Bloom
Adam Sabra

Santa Cruz (2)

Jeremy Hourigan
Roger Schoenman

Secretary/Parliamentarian

Katherine Yang (UCSF)



ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

June 11, 2026

Minutes of Meeting

I. ROLL CALL OF MEMBERS

Pursuant to the call, the Assembly of the Academic Senate met on Thursday, June 11, 2026. Academic Senate Chair Ahmet Palazoglu presided and called the meeting to order at 2:00 pm. Senate Executive Director Monica Lin called the roll of Assembly members and confirmed a quorum. Attendance is listed in Appendix A of these minutes.

II. MINUTES

ACTION: The Assembly approved the minutes of April 9, 2026.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS BY SENATE LEADERSHIP

- Ahmet Palazoglu, Chair
- Susannah Scott, Vice Chair

Apportionment of 2026-27 Assembly: The apportionment of Assembly representatives for the 2026-27 academic year was enclosed in the agenda. Campus representation remains unchanged from 2025–26.

Digital Accessibility Compliance: The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services extended the Section 504 digital accessibility compliance deadline to May 11, 2027. UC Office of the President (UCOP) will update its Information Technology Accessibility Policy to reflect the new federal deadline while continuing to expect campuses to make progress toward accessibility compliance under existing UC policy.

Federal Investigations: The U.S. Department of Justice has filed a new Title VI lawsuit against UCLA alleging discrimination against Jewish and Israeli students and seeking injunctive relief and the potential rescission of federal grant funding.

California Master Plan: Chair Palazoglu summarized his [remarks](#) to the Regents regarding the continued relevance of California's Master Plan for Higher Education. He suggested that California should consider developing a new Master Plan for Education to address evolving workforce, research, and student success needs, and emphasized the importance of collaboration across educational segments and the Academic Senate's participation in any future deliberations.

UCAD Plus: [UCAD Plus Task Force](#) workgroups are completing their recommendations. The final UCAD Plus report is expected by the end of August 2026 and will be circulated for systemwide Senate review in the fall.

Task Force on Health Sciences Clinical Faculty Governance: President Milliken has established a joint Senate-administration task force to recommend potential mechanisms for Health Sciences Clinical faculty to participate in UC Health governance. The task force was established following the [defeat of two memorials](#) in 2025 that sought Senate membership for faculty in the Health Sciences

Clinical and Adjunct Professor series, as well as the subsequent rejection of a Senate proposal to establish an Academic Council Special Committee on Clinical Affairs.

Discussion highlights

- Assembly members raised concerns about other DOJ investigations involving UC Davis and broader federal actions affecting higher education, and their implications for academic freedom.
- Members asked how the Clinical Faculty Governance Task Force will differ from previous proposals and whether it will revisit the Senate's 2025 decision on Senate membership. Chair Palazoglu explained that the task force is not reconsidering Senate membership, but has been charged with identifying alternative mechanisms for faculty participation in UC Health governance. He noted a shared interest by the administration and Senate leadership in ensuring these faculty have an appropriate voice in UC Health governance matters.

IV. Special Orders

A. Consent Calendar

The Assembly considered UCLA's request for variances to systemwide Senate Regulation [900](#). The variances repeal UCLA Divisional Regulations A-304.A.4 and 452 governing expected cumulative progress requirements for undergraduate students in the College of Letters and Science and align the College's minimum progress requirements with those of other UCLA colleges/schools.

ACTION: The Assembly approved the variances.

V. REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES

A. Academic Council

▪ Ahmet Palazoglu, Chair

1. Nomination and Election of the 2026-27 University Committee on Committees ([UCOC](#)) Vice Chair

ACTION: The Assembly elected Professor Dean Mathiowetz (UCSC) as 2026-27 UCOC Vice Chair by unanimous consent.

2. Conversion of Regents Standing Orders into Bylaws

Chair Palazoglu introduced a proposal from the Office of the Regents and endorsed by the Academic Council to continue the Regents' Office's efforts to modernize UC's governing documents by converting the remaining Regents' [Standing Orders](#) related to the Academic Senate and academic appointees into Regents bylaws and policies.

Deputy Chief of Staff to the Regents Clare Sheridan explained that the proposal makes no substantive policy changes but reorganizes existing provisions in the Regents' governing framework. She highlighted the creation of new Regents Policies that incorporate existing Standing Order provisions related to Senate membership, equivalent ranks and privileges, and academic units and functions; the rescission of corresponding Standing Orders; and an amendment to [Regents Bylaw 40.2](#) clarifying the Regents' intent that the Academic Senate has the authority to determine its own membership.

ACTION: The Assembly endorsed the proposal by a vote of 49-0.

3. Revisions to Senate Bylaw 337

Chair Palazoglu introduced proposed revisions to Senate Bylaw [337](#) endorsed by the Academic Council at their May 27, 2026 meeting. The amendments align the procedures outlined in Senate Bylaw 337 that govern early termination cases involving alleged violations of UC's Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment (SVSH) Policy with the corresponding provisions in Senate Bylaw [336](#), which governs disciplinary proceedings involving Senate faculty. Specifically, the revisions incorporate the Title IX evidentiary procedures and the preponderance of the evidence standard [adopted by the Assembly in 2021](#) for faculty disciplinary cases under Bylaw 336, ensuring consistency between the two bylaws and compliance with applicable federal Title IX regulations and state law.

University Committee on Privilege and Tenure ([UCPT](#)) Chair Susan Amussen and Principal Counsel Carly Munson explained that the revisions do not alter the role of Privilege and Tenure (P&T) Committees in determining whether good cause exists for early termination, but instead apply existing legal requirements to the limited subset of Bylaw 337 cases involving alleged SVSH violations.

Discussion highlights

- Members asked for clarification about differences between Bylaws 336 and 337 and whether the revisions would diminish P&T committee authority in early termination cases. Chair Amussen and Counsel Munson explained that the purpose of Bylaw 337 remains unchanged. P&T committees will continue to determine whether good cause exists for early termination and whether required procedures were followed. The revisions modify only the evidentiary procedures applicable to the limited category of cases involving alleged SVSH violations.
- Members also asked why the revisions were needed and whether they made substantive changes beyond the evidentiary standard. Chair Amussen and Counsel Munson explained that the Assembly adopted the same Title IX evidentiary procedures and preponderance of the evidence standard for Bylaw 336 in 2021 to comply with federal regulations and California law, but the corresponding changes to Bylaw 337 were inadvertently omitted at that time. The proposal corrects the omission by incorporating the same Title IX procedures, including reliance on the Title IX hearing record while preserving the Hearing Committee's discretion to consider newly discovered or other appropriate evidence. Because Bylaw 337-related cases are rare and the amendments apply only to SVSH-related cases, the changes are expected to have limited practical impact.

ACTION: Following the defeat of a motion to postpone consideration until the next Assembly meeting, the Assembly approved the proposed revisions by the required two-thirds majority. The vote was 44-2-2 (91% in favor).

VI. Announcements by Senior Executive Leadership

- **James B. Milliken, President**
- **Katherine S. Newman, Provost and Executive Vice President, Academic Affairs**

President's Remarks

Admissions: President Milliken addressed the renewed public attention surrounding standardized testing and UC undergraduate admissions, noting the national interest generated by a UC faculty petition calling for reconsideration of the University's testing policy. He expressed appreciation for the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools' (BOARS) ongoing review of admissions policies, noting that the review will extend beyond standardized testing to broader questions of academic preparation. He indicated that the process will help inform any decisions that would ultimately be made by the Board of Regents, and that there is continued Board interest around student preparation and A-G course requirements.

State Budget and Federal Funding: President Milliken reported that the State budget process produced a favorable 2026-27 operating budget for UC but did not address UC's significant capital needs. He expressed concern about structural budget deficits on many campuses, delays in the release of federal research funding, and continuing uncertainty around federal grant support. He encouraged support for State Senator Wiener's proposed higher education bond measure as an opportunity for California to invest in UC's research enterprise.

California Master Plan: President Milliken observed that recent legislative proposals have renewed discussion about California's Master Plan for Higher Education. He noted that UC needs more discussion around defining mutual expectations and responsibilities with the State to expand 21st century educational opportunities for Californians.

Artificial Intelligence: President Milliken announced the formation of a systemwide Artificial Intelligence Steering Committee, co-chaired by Senate Chair Palazoglu, UCSD Chancellor Pradeep Khosla, and UCOP Vice President of Digital Innovation & Technology and Chief Information Officer Van Williams. The committee will develop strategic recommendations to support UC's teaching, research, and operational use of AI, while identifying opportunities for systemwide collaboration and investment. The committee's guiding principle is to ensure that AI serves people and advances the University's public mission.

Discussion highlights

- Members encouraged the AI Steering Committee to articulate a vision for how AI will enhance, rather than diminish, the quality of UC education and research. They also urged the committee to support faculty by identifying effective instructional practices, sharing campus innovations, and developing resources to help prepare students to use AI responsibly. President Milliken agreed that the committee should define UC's educational mission in an AI-enabled environment and build on successful campus initiatives.
- Members stressed that the committee should also consider the broader societal implications of AI, including algorithmic bias, environmental impacts, climate and environmental justice, surveillance, and the need to preserve critical thinking and disciplinary expertise. President Milliken acknowledged these concerns, noting that the committee will draw on expertise from across the University through topic-specific workgroups. Chair Palazoglu added that environmental impacts had been discussed during the committee's inaugural meeting.
- Members also discussed the role of standardized testing in undergraduate admissions. President Milliken emphasized that BOARS' review will consider a broad range of issues related to academic preparation and that future discussions should be informed by faculty expertise and research.
- In response to questions about the California Master Plan, President Milliken suggested that UC should give thought to what a new state compact would look like to broadly address the state's needs rather than simply rewriting the 1960 Master Plan.

Provost's Remarks

International Partnerships: Provost Newman reported on her efforts to expand UC's international research collaborations in response to federal funding reductions. These include working with campus vice chancellors for research to develop partnerships with the Russell Group in the United Kingdom, Nordic research organizations, and other European institutions to foster large-scale collaborative research projects in climate resilience, clean energy, public health, and related fields.

Degree Plus: Provost Newman noted that the new Degree Plus initiative combines undergraduate degree programs with University Extension certificates and paid internships to better prepare students for the workforce. She also described UC's efforts to qualify its Extension programs for financial aid under the new federal Workforce Pell Grant program, which would support workforce training for both recent graduates and incumbent workers.

Federal Research Funding: Provost Newman expressed concern that the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) proposed revisions to the Uniform Guidance governing federal research grants would increase political oversight of grant awards, restrict international research collaborations and publication costs, expand federal authority to suspend or terminate grants, and fundamentally alter the peer-review process that underpins federally funded research. She encouraged faculty to participate in advocacy by submitting public comments to the OMB.

Discussion highlights

- Members expressed support for the international research initiative while encouraging UC to include institutions and scholars in the Global South. Provost Newman agreed that the current partnerships are intended to be an initial step toward a broader global research network.
- Members emphasized the importance of broad faculty participation in advocacy against the proposed OMB regulations. Provost Newman agreed that broad faculty engagement would be critical to preserving the integrity of the federal research enterprise.
- Members also noted the importance of the proposed California Science and Health Research Bond (Senate Bill 895) as a means of strengthening research capacity amid uncertainty in federal funding. Provost Newman expressed strong support for the proposal.

VII. 2026-27 Budget Outlook from State Governmental Relations (SGR)

▪ Seija Virtanen, Associate Director, State Budget

2026–27 State Budget: Associate Director Virtanen reported that the governor, State Assembly, and State Senate support a 10% year-over-year increase in UC's ongoing funding, consisting of a 7% Compact funding increase and restoration of a prior 3% deferral. She noted that discussions are ongoing about the proposed funding to support replacing nonresident enrollment with California resident enrollment at UCB, UCLA, and UCSD, as well as several one-time appropriations for health professional education programs.

Legislative Update: SGR continues to monitor legislation affecting UC, including proposals that would modify the respective roles of UC, CSU, and the California Community Colleges under the Master Plan for Higher Education, as well as bills affecting labor relations and research. Associate Director Virtanen also reviewed several higher education bond proposals under consideration, including the California Science and Health Research Bond and a proposed housing bond.

Discussion highlights

- Members asked about legislation that could alter the Master Plan. Associate Director Virtanen described several proposed bills that would expand the CSU's authority to offer doctoral degrees and broaden community college authority over four-year degree programs. She offered to provide the Assembly with additional information about the proposed legislation.

VIII. Reports of Standing Committees, Continued

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

▪ Dave Volz, BOARS Chair

1. 2026-2027 Policies and Partnerships Roadmap for First-Year Undergraduate Admissions

BOARS Chair Volz presented BOARS' 2026–27 Policies and Partnerships Roadmap, developed in response to a charge from Chair Palazoglu. The roadmap outlines a year-long process to evaluate first-year undergraduate admissions policies and strengthen partnerships with California's K-12 system. BOARS will establish two workgroups: one to examine the potential role of standardized testing in undergraduate admissions (Workgroup 1) and another to review the A-G subject requirements to determine whether they adequately prepare students for academic success at UC (Workgroup 2). The workgroups will be UC faculty-led and include ex-officio representation from CSU, K-12, and UCOP. Following review and public input, BOARS expects to transmit recommendations to the Academic Council by the end of July 2027 for systemwide Senate review in Fall 2027. Any approved changes would not take effect before the Fall 2029 admissions cycle.

Discussion highlights:

- Faculty expressed differing views about the proposed review of the A-G subject requirements. Several expressed concern that Workgroup 2 could revisit recent policy decisions about mathematics (Area C), unnecessarily reopen prior Senate deliberations, or weaken admissions standards. A member introduced a motion recommending that BOARS not convene Workgroup 2.
- Faculty opposing the motion argued that a comprehensive faculty-led review of the A-G framework is necessary to assess whether admissions requirements adequately prepare students for academic success at UC, improve consultation with K-12 and other educational partners, and preserve the Senate's authority over admissions policy.
- Chair Volz emphasized that Workgroup 2 was proposed by BOARS, not external stakeholders. He noted that its purpose is to examine whether the A-G framework can be strengthened, not to lower admissions standards. He explained that consultation with K-12 is part of BOARS' charge and that any recommendations would be developed through a faculty-led process.
- Faculty also expressed differing views about the need for a renewed review of standardized testing. Some argued that the [2020 study](#) by the Senate's Standardized Testing Task Force had already addressed the issue, while others supported reexamining testing in light of increasing concerns about students' academic preparation and grade inflation.

ACTION: The Assembly considered a motion recommending that BOARS not convene Workgroup 2. The motion failed by a vote of 5-26-15.

IX. REPORTS OF SPECIAL COMMITTEES [NONE]

X. PETITIONS OF STUDENTS [NONE]

XI. NEW BUSINESS [NONE]

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 pm

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

Attest: Ahmet Palazoglu, Academic Senate Chair

Attachments: Appendix A – Assembly Attendance Record, Meeting of June 11, 2026

**Appendix A – 2025-2026 Assembly Attendance Record
Meeting of June 11, 2026**

President of the University:

James B. Milliken

Academic Council Members:

Ahmet Palazoglu, Chair
Susannah Scott, Vice Chair
Mark Stacey, Chair, UCB
Katheryn Russ, Chair UCD
Jane Stoeve, Chair, UCI
Megan McEvoy, Chair, UCLA (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
Kristen Holmquist, Chair UCODE (absent)
Nael Abu-Ghazaleh, Chair, UCAP
Catherine Sugar, Chair, UCEP
Karen Bales, Chair, UCFW
James Weatherall, Chair, UCORP
Robert Brosnan, Chair, UCPB (absent)

Berkeley (5)

Doris Bachtrog
Chris Hoofnagle
Thomas Philip (alt for Hannah Ginsborg)
Tyrone Hayes
Daniel Sargent (absent)

Davis (6)

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

Irvine (4)

Yousef Al-Bulushi
German Andres Enciso
Oliver Eng
Veronica Vieira

Los Angeles (7)

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

Merced (1)

Sidra Goldman-Mellor (alt for Shilpa Khatri)

Riverside (2)

Harry Tom (alt for Marcus Kaul)
Manuela Martins-Green

San Diego (5)

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

San Francisco (5)

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

Santa Barbara (3)

Scott Hodges (atl for Eileen Boris)
Peter Bloom (alt for Christopher Kruegel)
Lisa Parks

Santa Cruz (2)

Jeremy Hourigan (alt for Melissa Caldwell)
Roger Schoenman

Secretary/Parliamentarian

Katherine Yang (UCSF)

III. **Announcements by the Chair (2:10 - 2:40 pm)**

- **Susannah Scott, Assembly Chair**

IV. **Reports of Standing Committees (2:20 - 3:00 pm)**

A. **Academic Council**

- **Susannah Scott, Council Chair**

1. Revision to Senate Bylaw 334 and 335 [Action]

Background and Rationale: At its July 22, 2026 meeting, the Academic Council endorsed proposed revisions to Academic Senate Bylaws [334](#) and [335](#). The revisions were developed by the University Committee on Privilege and Tenure (UCPT) to clarify that eligible non-Senate academic appointees may bring academic freedom grievances to divisional Privilege and Tenure committees using the procedures in Bylaw 335. They align the bylaws with Academic Personnel Manual (APM) - [010](#) and APM - [011](#), which extend academic freedom protections to all instructors and assign the Senate responsibility for adjudicating such grievances. The proposed changes would amend Bylaw 334 to expressly include these grievances within the jurisdiction of divisional P&T committees and revise Bylaw 335 to specify the applicable grievance procedures. The revisions are limited to academic freedom claims and do not create a broader grievance right for non-Senate appointees; students and trainees are not eligible.

UCPT developed the revisions to clarify a clear and consistent systemwide process and reduce confusion by creating the required alignment between our bylaws and the APM. . The University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction ([UCRJ](#)) found the proposed amendments to be consistent with the Code of the Academic Senate. Per Senate Bylaw [116.E](#), modification of a Senate bylaw requires the approval of two-thirds of all voting Assembly members present.

ACTION REQUESTED: Endorse the revisions to Senate Bylaw 334.

ACTION REQUESTED: Endorse the revisions to Senate Bylaw 335.

334. Privilege and Tenure: Divisional Committees -- Jurisdiction (En 23 May 2001)

In May 2001, Bylaws 334-337 replaced the former Senate Bylaw 335, which governed all divisional Privilege and Tenure activities. [See Legislative Rulings [3.73](#) , [12.80](#) , [3.93.A-B](#) , [4.94](#)]

- B. Divisional Privilege and Tenure Committees shall have jurisdiction to deal with ~~three-four~~ distinct categories of cases:

1. grievance cases (SBL335), where a member of the Senate claims injury through the violation of his/her rights and privileges;
- ~~1-2.~~ grievance cases where an eligible non-Senate academic appointee claims injury through violation of their academic freedom rights: such claims are heard by the Privilege and Tenure Committee following the procedures laid out in Bylaw 335;¹
- ~~2-3.~~ disciplinary cases (SBL 336), where a member of the Senate is accused of having violated the Faculty Code of Conduct; and
- ~~3-4.~~ early termination cases (SBL 337), where a Senate or non-Senate faculty member challenges whether there is good cause for his/her early termination.

Such committees may also be called upon by the campus administration of their Division to render advice on campus policies or local regulations that may affect academic privileges and tenure. [[See Legislative Ruling 12.80](#)]

¹ A list of eligible non-Senate academic titles is maintained by the Division's APO.

- C. At the end of every year, the Divisional Committee will supply a summary of its cases to the University Committee on Privilege and Tenure, to be used for statistical purposes only. This summary shall not include the name of any individual involved in a case before the Divisional Committee. For any matter held over from the previous year, the Committee shall report the final disposition of the case. The Divisional Committee shall also report any final disagreements with their Chancellor.
- D. Resolution of Disagreements with the Chancellor. After any formal hearing on grievance, discipline, or early termination, upon notice of the Chancellor's tentative decision to disagree with the Privilege and Tenure findings or recommendations, the Chair of the Divisional Privilege and Tenure Committee should either meet with the Chancellor or arrange for the full Divisional Privilege and Tenure Committee to meet with the Chancellor. The Committee is obliged to report the existence of agreement or disagreement with the Chancellor annually to the Division of the Senate, without divulging confidential information.

335. Privilege and Tenure: Divisional Committees -- Grievance Cases (En 23 May 01 - See [Bylaw 334](#))

A. Scope

- 1. Any member of the Academic Senate may grieve to the Divisional Privilege and Tenure Committee (hereafter, the Committee) that the member's rights or privileges have been violated. Before considering the grievance and determining whether a formal evidentiary hearing is warranted, the Committee may require that the grievant shall first exhaust all appropriate administrative avenues of redress. Administrative avenues of redress include, but are not limited to, presentation of the grievance along with a request for an administrative remedy to the department chair, dean, or other appropriate academic administrator with authority to investigate and offer a remedy.
- ~~1.2.~~ Any eligible non-Senate academic appointee with academic freedom rights may grieve to the Committee that those rights have been violated, following the procedures outlined in 335 A. (1). Students and trainees are not eligible.¹
- ~~2.3.~~ In cases of personnel review involving tenure, promotion, or reappointment, such grievances may be based only on allegations: (a) that the procedures were not in consonance with the applicable rules and requirements of the University or any of its Divisions, and/or (b) that the challenged decision was reached on the basis of impermissible criteria, including (but not limited to) race, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, or political conviction. The committee shall be empowered to determine the validity of the grievances under (a) or (b) but shall not be empowered to reevaluate the academic qualifications or professional competence of the grievant. (Am 14 Oct 2010)

B. Preliminary Procedure in Grievance Cases

- 1. For the purpose of advising Senate members on the available relief in case of a potential grievance, and non-Senate academic appointees in grievances alleging a violation of academic freedom, each Division, in accordance with specifications to be determined by such Division, shall appoint an individual or panel (preferably former members of the Privilege and Tenure Committee, but not current members) who shall be available to each grievant to discuss the claim of violation of rights and privileges and to provide advice on the appropriate procedure to be followed. Such individuals or panel members shall not

¹ A list of eligible non-Senate academic titles is maintained by the Division's APO.

serve as representatives of any grievant, and they shall maintain full confidentiality to the extent allowable by law. An ~~aggrieved- grievant Senate member~~ may consult with the individuals appointed under this provision with the understanding that the grievance will not be disclosed and that the consultation shall not constitute notice of the grievance to the campus or University administration. In cases where the grievance contains allegations of improper governmental activities and/or allegations of retaliation for reporting improper governmental activities, panel members shall inform grievants of their right to make a protected disclosure of allegations of improper governmental activities and/or allegations of retaliation for reporting improper governmental activities to the Locally Designated Official (LDO) pursuant to the Whistleblower Policy and the Whistleblower Protection Policy. Panel members also shall inform grievants that any such allegations that are part of a grievance brought to the Privilege and Tenure Committee will be reported to the LDO in accordance with the Whistleblower Policy and/or the Whistleblower Protection Policy. (Am 10 Mar 2004)

2. Upon receipt of a written grievance, the Privilege and Tenure Committee shall first determine whether or not the grieving Senate member has made out a *prima facie* case. This determination shall be limited to a review of the written grievance only. A *prima facie* case shall be deemed established if the Committee concludes that the allegations as stated in the written grievance, if true, would constitute a violation of the faculty member's rights and privileges. If the grievance includes allegations of improper governmental activities and/or allegations of retaliation for reporting improper governmental activities, the Committee shall report those allegations to the LDO in accordance with the Whistleblower Policy and/or the Whistleblower Protection Policy. (Am 10 Mar 2004)
3. If it finds that there is a *prima facie* case, the Committee may conduct a preliminary review of the evidence to determine whether there is sufficient reason to believe that a right or privilege of the grievant may have been violated. In the course of its preliminary review, the Committee shall provide the grievant with an opportunity to discuss his or her allegations with the Committee, either orally or in writing. Upon an appropriate showing of need by any party or on its own initiative, the Committee may request files and documents under the control of the administration, including the grievant's personnel files and confidential documents contained therein. Such confidential documents shall remain confidential within the committee unless disclosure is required by law. At this stage, the Committee may also give the administrator with authority to offer a remedy notice of the grievance and an opportunity to respond. To further facilitate its review, the Committee may also ask other persons involved in the events that gave rise to the grievance, including the department chair, to appear before or provide information to the Committee.
4. If the committee determines either that the grievant has not made out a *prima facie* case or that after a preliminary review, there is not sufficient reason to believe that the grievant's rights and privileges may have been violated, it shall advise the grievant to that effect in a written communication stating the reasons for its conclusion.
5. If the Committee determines that the grievant has made out a *prima facie* case of violation of a right or privilege, and that there is sufficient reason to believe that the grievant's rights and privileges may have been violated, the Committee shall advise the Chancellor's designee of the grievance and the *prima facie* determination. The Committee shall make an attempt to promote a resolution of the controversy between the grievant and the administrative officer, officers, or other persons concerned. If no resolution can be reached, the Committee shall conduct a formal hearing in accordance with the provisions set forth below.

6. No grievance may be considered by the Committee if more than three years have passed between the time the grievant knew or should have known about the violation of his/her rights and privileges and the resulting injury therefrom, and the filing of a grievance with the Committee.

C. Early Resolution

1. Any party may attempt to resolve the grievance informally through negotiations. Such negotiations may proceed with the assistance of impartial third parties, including one or more members of the Committee. A negotiated resolution is permissible and appropriate at any stage of these grievance procedures. If a negotiated resolution is reached after a written grievance is filed, then the Privilege and Tenure Committee should be given notice that the matter has been resolved.
2. The grievance may also be resolved through mediation in cases where such mediation is acceptable to the administration and the grievant. With the consent of the administration and the grievant, the Committee may assist in the selection of an appropriate mediator. Other relevant parties, including members of the Committee, may participate in the mediation.

D. Hearing and Posthearing Procedures

1. The Privilege and Tenure Committee shall appoint a Hearing Committee for each grievance case that is not resolved through a negotiated resolution or mediation. The Hearing Committee should consist of at least three Division members. At least two of the members shall be members of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure, one of whom shall chair the Hearing Committee. The committee may not appoint a member of the department or equivalent administrative unit of any of the parties to the Hearing Committee. Hearing Committee members shall disclose to the Hearing Committee any circumstances that may interfere with their objective consideration of the case and recuse themselves as appropriate. A quorum for the conduct of the hearing shall consist of at least half but not less than three members of the Hearing Committee, including at least one member of the Committee on Privilege and Tenure.
2. Prior to the formal hearing, the chair of the Hearing Committee shall schedule a conference with the parties and/or their representatives. This conference should attempt to:
 - a. Determine the facts about which there is no dispute. At the hearing, these facts may be established by stipulation.
 - b. Define the issues to be decided by the hearing committee.
 - c. Set a time for both sides to exchange a list of witnesses and copies of exhibits to be presented at the hearing. The Hearing Committee has the discretion to limit each party to those witnesses whose names were disclosed to the other party prior to the hearing and to otherwise limit evidence to that which is relevant to the issues before the hearing committee.
 - d. Specify whether prehearing and post-hearing briefs will be submitted by the parties as well as the deadlines for those briefs.
 - e. Attain agreement about whether any person other than the Chancellor, the Chancellor's designee, the grievant, and their representatives may be present

during all or part of the hearing. In order to preserve the confidentiality of the hearing, persons whose presence is not essential to a determination of the facts shall, as a general rule, be excluded from the hearing.

3. The Chancellor's designee, the grievant, and/or their representatives shall be entitled to be present at all sessions of the Hearing Committee when evidence is being received. Each party shall have the right to be represented by counsel, to present its case by oral and documentary evidence, to submit rebuttal evidence, and to conduct such cross examination as may be required for a full and true disclosure of the facts.
4. The hearing need not be conducted according to the technical legal rules relating to evidence and witnesses. The Hearing Committee may, upon an appropriate showing of need by any party or on its own initiative, request files and documents under the control of the administration. All confidential information introduced into evidence, including the identity of confidential sources of personnel evaluations, shall remain so within the Hearing Committee. The Hearing Committee may call witnesses or make evidentiary requests on its own volition. The Hearing Committee also has the discretion to require that all witnesses affirm the veracity of their testimony.
5. No evidence other than that presented at the hearing shall be considered by the Hearing Committee or have weight in the proceedings, except that the Hearing Committee may take notice of any judicially noticeable facts that are commonly known. Parties present at the hearing shall be informed of matters thus noticed, and each party shall be given a reasonable opportunity to object to the Hearing Committee's notice of such matters.
6. The Divisional Committee on Privilege and Tenure may, at its discretion, request the appointment of a qualified person or persons, designated by the Chair of the University Committee on Privilege and Tenure, to provide legal advice and/or to assist in the organization and conduct of the hearing.
7. At the hearing, the grievant shall bear the burden of proving the validity of the grievance by a preponderance of the evidence.
8. At the conclusion of the hearing, the Hearing Committee shall promptly make its findings of fact, conclusions supported by a statement of reasons based on the evidence, and recommendation, and forward these to the parties in the case, the Chancellor, the Chair of the Divisional Committee on Privilege and Tenure, and the Chair of the University Committee on Privilege and Tenure. The findings, conclusions, recommendations, and record of the proceedings shall be confidential to the extent allowed by law and UC policy. The Hearing Committee may, however, with the consent of the grievant, authorize release of the findings, conclusions, and recommendations to other individuals or entities, to the extent allowed by law.
9. The hearing shall be recorded. The Hearing Committee has the discretion to use a certified court reporter (whose cost is borne by the administration) for this purpose, and the parties and their representatives shall have the right to a copy of the recording or transcript. The cost of the copy shall be assumed by the requesting party.
10. The Hearing Committee may reconsider a case if either party presents, within a reasonable time after the decision, newly discovered facts or circumstances that might significantly affect the previous decision and that were not reasonably discoverable at the time of the hearing.

E. Grievance Cases Related to Disciplinary Cases

1. There are circumstances in which the same set of facts and allegations lead to both a disciplinary matter and a grievance before the Committee. Under these circumstances, when a single hearing is held, the Committee shall make separate reports of findings, conclusions, and recommendations for the grievance and for the disciplinary matter.
 - a. When a grievance involves the same set of facts that are the subject of a disciplinary matter, the Committee on Privilege and Tenure may, at its discretion, hold either matter in abeyance while it proceeds with the other. Alternatively, the Committee may, with the consent of the grievant, the accused in the disciplinary matter, and the Chancellor's designee, consider both matters within a single hearing.
 - b. When a Senate member facing disciplinary charges files a grievance involving the same set of facts and circumstances as the disciplinary matter, the Committee on Privilege and Tenure has the discretion to consider both matters within a single hearing.
2. When a Senate member files a grievance which is based upon the same facts and incidents involved in a prior disciplinary hearing at which the same Senate member was accused of violating the Code of Conduct, the findings and conclusions of the prior disciplinary hearing shall be conclusive.

- V. Announcements by Senior Executive Leadership (3:00 - 4:00 pm)**
 - James B. Milliken, President
 - Ralph Hexter, Interim Provost and Executive Vice President
 - Nathan Brostrom, Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer

 - VI. Reports of Standing Committees, Continued (4:00 – 4:30)**
 - B. Academic Council**
 - Susannah Scott, Council Chair
 - 1. Academic Council [Charges to BOARS](#) on Standardized Testing and the A-G Framework

 - VII. Special Orders**
 - A. Consent Calendar [NONE]
 - B. Annual Reports [2025-26]

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



ACADEMIC COUNCIL ANNUAL REPORT 2025-26

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The [Academic Council](#) is the executive committee of the Assembly of the Academic Senate. It acts on behalf of the Assembly on non-legislative matters, advises the University president, and has the responsibility through its committee structure to investigate and report to the Assembly on matters of University-wide concern. Council held 11 regular meetings and one special meeting in the 2025-26 academic year, including four at UC Office of the President, to consider multiple initiatives, proposals, and reports. Council's final recommendations and reports are available on the [Academic Senate website](#). Key issues addressed this year are summarized below.

PROTECTING UC'S MISSION IN THE FACE OF DISRUPTIONS

Federal actions and political pressures continued to shape much of Council's work in 2025-26, raising urgent questions about institutional autonomy, academic freedom, the research enterprise, and the University's obligations to affected faculty, students, and staff. Council engaged regularly with President Milliken, Provost Newman, and other senior executive leaders about federal funding disruptions, investigations, immigration restrictions, disclosure of personal information, and efforts to influence academic programs and policies. Council members consistently emphasized the importance of transparent communication, meaningful faculty consultation, and coordinated action to protect UC's public mission and academic core.

UCAD and UCAD Plus: The Senate Task Force on UC Adaptation to Disruptions ([UCAD](#)) reconvened to refine its draft report in response to [systemwide feedback](#) and develop additional strategies to help UC sustain its mission. UCAD met throughout fall 2025, drawing on the expertise of Council members and engaging with systemwide administrative partners. In January 2026, Council endorsed UCAD's [final report](#), which offered recommendations on research funding assistance, faculty evaluations, academic program restructuring, instructional flexibility, graduate education, and other strategies to strengthen UC's resilience amid fiscal, political, and other external pressures. Refined through systemwide review, the UCAD report emphasized that decisions affecting academic programs and priorities must preserve UC's core mission, respect campus autonomy, and be led by faculty through established shared governance processes.

Provost Newman and Council Chair Palazoglu also convened [UCAD Plus](#), a joint Senate-administration task force that included Senate UCAD members and worked throughout the year to examine longer-term planning issues. A preliminary UCAD Plus report will be circulated for systemwide review in fall 2026. Council received periodic updates on the recommendations of the five UCAD Plus workgroups and endorsed a structured divisional review process intended to distinguish recommendations ready for implementation from those requiring further development or consideration.

Statement on Federal Demand Letter to UCLA: Council approved a [statement](#) opposing any agreement with the federal government that would compromise UC's institutional autonomy or academic freedom and calling for meaningful Senate participation in discussions concerning a potential settlement.

Statement on Disclosures of Personally Identifiable Information (PII): Council approved a [statement](#) urging UC to strengthen privacy safeguards, provide timely notice and support to individuals affected by disclosures of PII, and consult faculty experts when evaluating future federal requests that may include PII. The issue was also considered at a November 2025 special meeting of the Assembly convened in response to a faculty petition.

UNDERGRADUATE ADMISSIONS AND STUDENT PREPARATION

BOARS Roadmap and Academic Council's Charges to BOARS: In June 2026, the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools ([BOARS](#)) chair presented BOARS' 2026–27 roadmap the committee had approved for reviewing standardized testing and the A–G framework in response to a special charge from Senate leadership issued in February. In July 2026, Council convened an emergency meeting after BOARS voted to rescind their previously approved roadmap. Council subsequently [charged](#) BOARS to assess the advantages and disadvantages of standardized testing and its possible uses in UC undergraduate admissions and submit a report and policy recommendations by February 12, 2027. Council also charged BOARS to begin an overarching review of the A–G framework and provide an initial report by May 14, 2027.

Mathematics (Area C) Undergraduate Admissions Requirements: Council distributed a BOARS [statement](#) reaffirming UC's longstanding math admissions requirements, including the foundational three-course sequence and a recommended additional year of advanced mathematics.

AP Exam Scoring: Council distributed [recommendations](#) issued jointly by BOARS, the University Committee on Educational Policy ([UCEP](#)), and the University Committee on Preparatory Education ([UCOPE](#)) that encouraged campuses to monitor changes associated with the College Board's new Advanced Placement (AP) exam scoring methodology and reassess the use of AP scores for admissions, college course credit, and course placement as warranted.

TOEFL iBT Minimum Score: Council distributed BOARS' [decision](#) establishing a new systemwide minimum TOEFL iBT score of 4.5 to align with the test's revised scoring scale and maintain consistent expectations for English language proficiency.

Associate Degree for Transfer Pilot Programs: Council distributed BOARS [guidance](#) outlining recommended timelines and steps for developing UC campus-specific Associate Degree for Transfer pilot programs while preserving divisional discretion over implementation.

UCOPE Bylaw and Regulations: Following systemwide review, Council returned to UCOPE their proposed revisions to Senate Bylaw [192](#) and Senate Regulations [636](#) and [761](#) for further clarification of the committee's oversight responsibilities, coordination with BOARS and UCEP, and governance of current student placement practices.

BUDGET ISSUES

Monthly Budget Briefings: Senior UC Office of the President (UCOP) administrators provided regular updates on the development of the 2026–27 state budget and UC budget plan; budget negotiations and advocacy; federal fiscal developments; enrollment goals and tuition policy; capital, housing, finance, and investment strategies; and other financial issues. Council emphasized the need to protect UC's academic mission, address structural campus deficits, and secure sustained investment in infrastructure and deferred maintenance amid rising labor, health care, housing, and other operating costs.

Mortgage Origination Program: Council received an update on plans to support the long-term sustainability of the Mortgage Origination Program ([MOP](#)) by transitioning MOP to a capital-markets

funding model and a new seven-year adjustable-rate mortgage structure intended to expand capacity, reduce reliance on the Short-Term Investment Pool (STIP), and preserve the program's long-term value as a faculty recruitment and retention tool.

Athletics Funding: Council reviewed a University Committee on Planning and Budget ([UCPB](#)) report calling for more transparent and consistent athletics financial reporting, campus-specific assessments of the costs and benefits of institutional support, and consideration of systemwide options to better align intercollegiate athletics funding with UC's academic priorities.

Graduate Student Costs: Council reviewed a UCPB analysis comparing representative graduate student costs and funding sources in English and Chemistry programs across campuses. The report highlighted substantial variation, the absence of standardized systemwide data, and the need for more consistent reporting to inform decisions about the future affordability and scale of graduate education.

FACULTY WELFARE ISSUES

UCRP Assumed Rate of Return: Council unanimously [endorsed](#) a recommendation from the University Committee on Faculty Welfare ([UCFW](#)) and its Task Force on Investment and Retirement ([TFIR](#)) to increase the University of California Retirement Plan's (UCRP) assumed rate of return from 6.75% to 7.25%, while emphasizing strict adherence to Regents Policy [5601](#) and the use of employer contributions to address any future investment shortfalls.

Total Remuneration Study: Council [endorsed](#) UCFW recommendations that the upcoming study of UC employee total remuneration assess the competitiveness of UC's current benefits using employees in the 2016 UCRP tier and an employee-value methodology, with Senate participation in reviewing and presenting the results.

IT Accessibility: Following a systemwide review, Council [supported](#) the goals of revised Presidential Policy [IMT-1300](#) (Information Technology Accessibility) while recommending substantial funding and staffing, a phased implementation timeline, clearer guidance, and streamlined processes to ensure that compliance is both feasible and sustainable. UC leaders joined Council to discuss the feedback, acknowledging the challenging legal deadlines, substantial resource and workload challenges, and the need for centralized tools, clearer priorities, streamlined processes, and institutional—rather than individual faculty—responsibility for compliance.

2026 Health Benefits: UC Systemwide Human Resources briefed Council on major changes to the 2026 health benefits portfolio intended to address rising costs while preserving affordability and equity across employee pay bands. The UCFW Health Care Task Force ([HCTF](#)) highlighted concerns about the distributional effects and long-term sustainability of the new premium-setting model and called for earlier Senate involvement in future decisions, transparent actuarial analysis, and multi-year planning.

RASC and UCPath Security: Council [endorsed](#) UCFW recommendations calling for stronger oversight and communication regarding reported Retirement Administration Service Center ([RASC](#)) and UCPath security lapses, prompt reimbursement for affected individuals, and an advisory group representing retirees and the Academic Senate.

Return to Active Duty Processes: Council [endorsed](#) UCFW recommendations to simplify and strengthen administrative support for Return to Active Duty (RTAD) appointments by establishing centralized campus or systemwide expertise to provide recalled faculty and staff with clear and consistent RTAD guidance.

ACADEMIC PERSONNEL ISSUES

Meetings with Academic Personnel Leaders: At each meeting, the deputy provost for Systemwide Academic Personnel and the vice provost for Faculty Affairs and Academic Programs joined Council to discuss academic personnel initiatives, legislation, policy reviews, and the progress of task forces, including work on faculty discipline and expressive activities, the Degree Plus Pilot Program, and the Early Career Faculty Award Program. The associate vice president of Employee and Labor Relations joined these colleagues for a portion of most meetings for executive session discussions of academic labor relations, including graduate student bargaining.

Math Fellows: Council approved a revision to Senate Regulation 750 adding “Math Fellow” (formerly Visiting Assistant Professor) as an instructional title authorized to teach both lower- and upper-division courses, implementing a UC-UAW bargaining agreement to use the title as a narrowly defined instructional position. The Assembly [approved](#) the amendment at the October 9, 2025 meeting.

Academic Personnel Manual (APM) - 015 and 016: Following a systemwide review, Council [endorsed](#) revisions to APM - 015 and - 016 intended to improve the consistency and timeliness of faculty disciplinary proceedings while preserving due process, academic freedom, and faculty self-governance. The revisions established recommended procedural timelines, created a Systemwide Reserve Privilege and Tenure Pool, and clarified disciplinary guidance and procedures.

APM - 036: Following a systemwide review, Council [transmitted](#) comments on proposed revisions to APM - 036 addressing the state’s legal requirements governing official letters of recommendation for potential employment and clarifying employment classifications, compensation standards, timekeeping, meal and rest breaks, and lactation accommodations for academic appointees.

UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

UC Online: Council discussed [UC Online](#) at several meetings, including its evolving role as a systemwide resource for technology, data, policy, and administrative coordination, as well as concerns about academic integrity, course articulation, cross-campus enrollment, governance, and sustainable funding. Council ultimately [endorsed](#) recommendations from [UCEP](#) calling for a comprehensive assessment of UC Online’s educational outcomes, costs, and operating model, together with stronger independent oversight, clearer shared governance processes, and more sustainable funding and funds-flow arrangements.

Academic Integrity and Intellectual Property: Council [endorsed](#) and distributed UCEP’s annual reminder encouraging faculty to take steps to deter academic dishonesty and the unauthorized sharing of instructional materials, including clarifying expectations for generative AI use.

Online Program Management Companies: Following a systemwide review, Council [supported](#) the goals of the [interim Presidential Policy](#) on UC’s use of online program management companies while recommending stronger provisions for faculty oversight, student data and intellectual property protections, policy clarity, enforcement, and transparency.

Civil Rights Syllabus Template: Council [distributed](#) a voluntary sample syllabus statement developed by the Systemwide Office of Civil Rights to help faculty direct students to campus resources for accommodation, discrimination or harassment reporting, and other support services.

Education Loan Practices: Following systemwide review, Council [supported](#) proposed [revisions](#) to Presidential Policy on Education Loan Practices addressing deferred tuition plans while recommending clearer terminology, disclosures, reporting and oversight requirements, and monitoring of equity impacts and financial risks.

GRADUATE EDUCATION

Degree and School Approvals: Following recommendations from the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs ([CCGA](#)), UCEP, and UCPB, Council approved the following degree programs, schools, and program name changes.

- [UCLA Master of Population Data Science \(MPDS\)](#) (7/26)
- [UCD Master of Preventive Veterinary Medicine and One Health \(eMPVM\)](#) (7/26)
- [UCD Master of Education and Teaching Credential \(METC\)](#) (6/26)
- [UCB Master of Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning \(MAIML\)](#) (6/26)
- [UCSD Master of Design \(M.Des\)](#) (5/26)
- [Name Change for UCSD School of Computing, Information and Data Sciences](#) (5/26)
- [UCSB Master of Engineering and Technology Leadership \(METL\)](#) (5/26)
- [UCD Online Master of Engineering in Water Resources Engineering](#) (3/26)
- [UCD Online Master of Engineering in Biomedical Engineering for Healthcare Technologies](#) (3/26)
- [UCR Online Master of Business Administration](#) (3/26)
- [UCD Online Master of Engineering in Sustainable Transportation](#) (1/26)
- [Name Change for the UCD School of Veterinary Medicine](#) (12/25)

Asynchronous Online Graduate Programs: Council approved the fully asynchronous UCD Master of Engineering in Water Resources Engineering while raising broader concerns about student engagement, academic integrity, AI, and program quality in asynchronous degree programs. Council asked CCGA to examine existing asynchronous degree programs and report back on appropriate review standards and outcomes.

CSU Doctoral Program Proposals: UCOP's academic planning team briefed Council on the review process established under State Assembly Bill [656](#), which authorizes the California State University (CSU) to propose professional and applied doctoral programs subject to UC review for duplication with existing or planned UC degrees. Council later [endorsed](#) CCGA's review of seven proposals, supporting two and opposing five that were determined to substantially duplicate UC programs.

Senate Regulation 904: Council endorsed and forwarded to the Assembly a clarifying amendment to Senate Regulation [904](#), adding "academic notice" to the terminology governing graduate student academic standing and aligning the regulation with related Senate regulations 900 and 902.

RESEARCH

Office of Research and Innovation: The vice president for Research and Innovation briefed Council on the rapid expansion of sponsor-driven research security and compliance requirements, including growing restrictions on publication, data sharing, and participation, and emphasized the need for faculty consultation and clear systemwide guidance that protects UC's research mission while minimizing administrative burdens.

Research Misconduct Policy: Following a systemwide review, Council [supported](#) updating the Presidential Policy on Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct to align with federal regulations while recommending clearer definitions, stronger due process and whistleblower protections, more detailed implementation guidance, and attention to digital research records and the use of generative AI.

Research Funding Transparency: Council reviewed the University Committee on Research Policy's ([UCORP](#)) concerns about the growing role of private research funding and supported further study of

ways to improve transparency while protecting academic freedom, financial donor confidentiality, researcher safety, and existing conflict-of-interest processes. The Council chair subsequently charged the UCORP Workgroup on Research Funding Transparency to identify best practices for funding disclosure at the individual, campus, and systemwide levels and recommend UC policies for research funding transparency.

Tribal Lands Report: Following a systemwide review, Council [supported](#) the report's goals of strengthening UC's relationships with Tribal communities while recommending meaningful Tribal participation, clearer governance and accountability, adequate implementation resources, practical research guidance, and protections for academic freedom.

Shared Research Infrastructure and AI Resources: Council [endorsed](#) and transmitted UCPB recommendations for a coordinated systemwide strategy to inventory, share, and invest in core research facilities, major equipment, and AI tools while reducing duplication and financial and administrative barriers to cross-campus use of these resources.

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

AI Workgroup Report: Council [endorsed and distributed](#) the final report of the Academic Senate Workgroup on Artificial Intelligence, which offered recommendations across research, instruction, admissions, and data stewardship guided by the principles of faculty agency, adaptability, and trustworthiness. The report was intended as a framework for continued Senate-led discussion and collaboration with the administration as AI technologies and institutional practices evolve.

UCOLASC Recommendations on AI: Council reviewed University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication ([UCOLASC](#)) recommendations calling for library representation in systemwide AI discussions and reaffirming open access, author control, computational research rights, AI literacy, protection of unpublished materials and data, and human peer judgment in scholarly evaluation.

CAMPUS CLIMATE AND SAFETY

UCPD Gold Book: Following a systemwide review of proposed revisions to the UC Police Department (UCPD) Gold Book, Council [recommended](#) substantial improvements to revised sections emphasizing de-escalation; protection of academic freedom and expressive activity; stronger oversight and transparency; safeguards governing force; surveillance and military equipment; and policies tailored to the distinctive university environment.

HEALTH SCIENCES

Clinical Faculty Task Force: Chair Palazoglu served on a joint Senate-administration Presidential Task Force on Models of Governance for Clinical Faculty in the UC Health System, charged by President Milliken to examine how health sciences clinical faculty can meaningfully participate in shared governance.

Statement on Gender-Affirming Care: Council [endorsed](#) a UCFW-HCTF statement urging UC to maintain and protect its commitment to providing gender-affirming care and supporting related research, education, and clinical training despite external political pressures.

Anatomical Donation Program Policy: Following systemwide review, Council [supported](#) proposed revisions to the Presidential Policy on Anatomical Donation Programs and Anatomical Materials while recommending clearer definitions, scope, governance responsibilities, training requirements, and ethical safeguards for the acquisition and use of human anatomical materials.

DIVERSITY AND EQUITY

UCODE Name Change: Following a systemwide Senate review, Council endorsed proposed revisions to Senate Bylaw [140](#) renaming the University Committee on Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equity (UCAADE) as the University Committee on Diversity and Equity ([UCODE](#)), and removing references to “affirmative action” without changing the committee’s core responsibilities. The Assembly [approved](#) the amendments at their February 12, 2026 meeting.

ARO Implementation: In fall 2025, Council [supported](#) a joint Senate committee effort to gather information on how campuses are implementing Achievement Relative to Opportunity (ARO) principles in academic personnel reviews, with the goal of promoting more equitable and consistent practices. After reviewing the resulting report in June 2026, Council directed the University Committee on Academic Personnel ([UCAP](#)) to work with the Division of Academic Affairs, in consultation with UCODE and UCFW, to develop an implementation proposal addressing faculty awareness, consistency, assessment, and the possible codification of ARO principles in the Academic Personnel Manual.

PPFP: The director of the President's Postdoctoral Fellowship Program ([PPFP](#)) joined Council to discuss the history, status, and impact of the PPFP. Council also reviewed UCODE concerns that revised PPFP search waiver guidance could create uncertainty and weaken recruitment of PPFP candidates. Council referred the issue to UCAP for further review of campus policies and practices before additional Council consideration.

CLIMATE AND SUSTAINABILITY

Sustainable Practices Policy: Following a systemwide review, Council [expressed support](#) for proposed revisions to the Presidential Policy on Sustainable Practices while recommending clearer and more measurable requirements, cost effectiveness analyses and implementation funding, equitable campus flexibility, and greater emphasis on direct emissions reductions.

Proposed Systemwide Senate Committee: Following a systemwide review, Council [declined to advance](#) a proposal sponsored by the UCSD and UCSF Senate divisions for a new standing Senate Committee on Climate Change and Sustainability because it lacked broad support, while reaffirming the importance of stronger Senate coordination and faculty engagement through existing or more targeted structures.

FACULTY DISCIPLINE AND PRIVILEGE AND TENURE

Senate Bylaws 195 and 336: As part of the coordinated revision of faculty discipline policies, the University Committee on Privilege and Tenure ([UCPT](#)) developed conforming bylaw amendments formalizing its role in managing the Systemwide Reserve Privilege and Tenure Pool and clarifying timelines and procedures for disciplinary hearings. Council endorsed and forwarded the amendments to the Assembly, which [approved](#) them at their February 12, 2026 meeting.

Senate Bylaw 337: Council endorsed and forwarded to the Assembly UCPT-developed amendments to Senate Bylaw [337](#) aligning early termination proceedings involving alleged violations of the Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment Policy with the Title IX evidentiary procedures and standard of proof outlined in Senate Bylaw 336. The Assembly [approved](#) the amendments at their June 11, 2026 meeting.

OTHER BRIEFINGS AND ISSUES

Senior Executive Leaders: President Milliken, Provost Newman, and Chief Financial Officer Brostrom joined Council meetings, as their schedules permitted, to exchange views with the faculty on issues concerning campus climate, federal disruptions, legal matters, online education, the UC

budget, Regents' agenda items and presentations, the future of higher education and public perceptions, and other initiatives and topics.

Meeting with Chair of the Regents: Board of Regents Chair Reilly met with Council in October 2025 to discuss her priorities and engage with the faculty on common goals for access, basic needs, UC Health, federal pressures, academic freedom, public confidence in higher education, and research.

External Relations and Communications: Senior Vice President Turner briefed Council on UC's federal and state advocacy priorities and emphasized the importance of mobilizing faculty expertise, strengthening campus coordination, and expanding digital, legislative, and coalition-based outreach in a polarized and uncertain policy environment.

Systemwide Procurement: Associate Vice President Williams briefed Council on UC's efforts to make procurement more strategic, efficient, and collaborative through long-range sourcing plans, improved spending data, and earlier engagement with faculty and researchers.

State Governmental Relations: The Office of State Governmental Relations ([SGR](#)) briefed Council throughout the year on state budget negotiations, legislation and ballot measures affecting UC, advocacy priorities, and evolving debates over enrollment, research funding, housing, labor, data privacy, and the California Master Plan for Higher Education. The briefings also emphasized UC's engagement with legislators and coalition partners to protect the University's funding, research mission, academic quality, and institutional flexibility.

ACSCOLI: Academic Council Special Committee on Laboratory Issues ([ACSCOLI](#)) Chair Valdevit briefed the Council about the work of ACSCOLI and the UC-managed National Laboratories.

Regents Health Services Committee: Council selected UCLA Professor Michael Ong for a second two-year term of service as the Senate representative to the Regents Health Services Committee.

2026 Oliver Johnson Award: Council selected UC San Diego Professor Robert Horwitz and UCLA Professor Adrienne Lavine as recipients of the [2026 Oliver Johnson Award for Distinguished Leadership in the Academic Senate](#).

Reports from Division Chairs: Council set aside time at each meeting for reports from Senate division chairs. These touched on a wide range of topics, including campus budget pressures, structural deficits, staff reductions, and the need for greater transparency and faculty participation in financial planning. Chairs also discussed strains on shared governance, academic freedom, faculty morale and workload, graduate education and student support, and the effects of federal actions involving immigration, research funding, institutional autonomy, and disclosure of personally identifiable information. Other issues included undergraduate preparation and admissions, particularly in math; faculty discipline and student disability accommodations; cybersecurity and digital accessibility mandates; and the expansion of AI. Chairs highlighted administrative leadership transitions, campus planning initiatives, and efforts to strengthen Senate communication, consultation, and oversight during a period of financial and political uncertainty.

ADDITIONAL SYSTEMWIDE REVIEWS

In addition to those previously mentioned, Council sent comments on the following presidential policy revisions circulated for systemwide Senate review:

- [Systemwide Review of Proposed Revisions to PACAOS 100.00 and PACAOS-Appendix H](#) (6/26)
- [Systemwide Review of Proposed Presidential Policy BFB-BUS-43](#) (7/26)

RELATIONS WITH OTHER GOVERNING BODIES

Conversion of Regents Standing Orders: Office of the Regents Deputy Chief of Staff Sheridan presented a proposal to convert the remaining Regents Standing Orders concerning the Senate and academic appointees into Regents Bylaws and Policies, including a clarification affirming the Senate’s authority to determine its own membership; Council endorsed the proposal and forwarded it to the Assembly. The Assembly unanimously [endorsed](#) the proposal at their June 11, 2026 meeting.

Board of Regents: Chair Palazoglu and Vice Chair Scott executed their roles as faculty representatives to the UC Regents throughout the year, acting in that capacity on Regents’ standing committees and the full board. Chair Palazoglu delivered remarks to the Regents at each meeting; these can be found on the [Academic Senate website](#).

ICAS: Chair Palazoglu, Vice Chair Scott, and the chairs of BOARS, UCOPE, and UCEP attended meetings of the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates ([ICAS](#)), which represents the faculty Senates of the three segments of California public higher education.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We express our gratitude to UC Office of the President colleagues for their work and productive collaboration with the Senate over the past year. In particular, we thank the senior UC managers and staff who, as consultants to the Academic Council, contributed significantly to Council’s work and deliberations: President Milliken; Provost and Executive Vice President Newman; Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer Brostrom; Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer Nava; Senior Vice President Turner; Vice President and Chief of Staff Kao; Vice President Maldonado; Vice President and Chief Information Officer Williams; Vice Provost Varsanyi; Deputy Provost Lee; Associate Vice Provost Moe; Associate Vice President Fullerton; Associate Vice President Matella; Associate Vice President Gutekunst; Associate Vice President Díaz; Associate Vice President and Chief Procurement Officer Williams; Chief Information Security Officer Ratzlaff; Senior Executive Director Jenkins; Executive Advisor Greenspan; Deputy Chief of Staff Sheridan; Principal Counsel Finneman; Associate Director Virtanen; Director Chandra; Director Corona; Director Lawson; Director Mays; Director Thai; and Director Tobias.

Respectfully submitted:

Ahmet Palazoglu, Chair
Susannah Scott, Vice Chair

Divisional Chairs:

Mark Stacey, UCB
Katheryn Russ, UCD
Jane Stoevers, UCI
Megan McEvoy, UCLA
Kevin Mitchell, UCM
Kenneth Barish, UCR
Rebecca Jo Plant, UCSD
Errol Lobo, UCSF
Rita Raley, UCSB
Matthew McCarthy, UCSC

Senate Committee Chairs:

Nael Abu-Ghazaleh, UCAP
Dave Volz, BOARS
Partho Ghosh, CCGA
Kristen Holmquist, UCODE
Catherine Sugar, UCEP
Karen Bales, UCFW
Robert Brosnan, UCPB
James Weatherall, UCORP

Council Staff:

Monica Lin, Executive Director
Michael LaBriola, Assistant Director



UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC COMPUTING AND COMMUNICATIONS ANNUAL REPORT 2025-2026

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Academic Computing and Communications (UCACC) is charged in Senate Bylaw 155 to represent the Senate in all matters involving the uses and impact of computing and communications technology and advise the President concerning the acquisition, usage and support of computing and communications technology and related policy issues. UCACC held four meetings via Zoom in 2025-26. UCACC's primary topics of discussion included the new UC IT Accessibility Policy and accompanying requirements, digital security planning efforts, artificial intelligence, research security, and data storage. Members shared information from their campuses and engaged with administrators at UCOP. This report highlights the committee's discussions and activities during the year.

IT Accessibility

UCACC discussed the proposed UC IT Accessibility Policy throughout the year and conveyed its concerns via a memo to the Academic Council Chair during the systemwide review period. At each meeting, members reported on their campus' efforts to work towards compliance with the new UC policy and the federal accessibility requirements, often with limited resources. Campuses have developed websites, licensed new compliance tools, and implemented targeted guidance projects. One campus hired a group of students to serve as an accessibility assistance team.

In April, UCACC was joined by three administrators from UCOP: Chief Digital Experience and Engagement Officer Kate Miffitt, Director of Application Engineering Judy Thai, and UC Legal Principal Counsel Trevor Finneman. The administrators provided an update on the IT Accessibility Policy and requirements after the federal deadline was postponed, noting that the postponement allows more time for resource development and accountability processes. They confirmed that focus should remain on high-impact areas, such as public-facing websites, high-volume instructional materials, and new content.

Digital security

UCACC learned about contract negotiations with new digital security vendors and encouraged UCOP administrators to communicate broadly regarding digital security requirements and expectations for faculty, with clear information about what data is collected, who can view it, and how long it is retained. Faculty involvement at all divisions should be regular and programmatic. The partnership between UC Berkeley's Senate IT committee and campus IT administrators may provide an example for other divisions. The committee receives regular briefings from IT administrators about how the campus is addressing attacks via endpoint detection and response (EDR) systems and other means. UCACC members suggested that IT administrators work to build trust with faculty by prefacing their communications about digital security with information about data protection and privacy. Campus privacy officers should be monitoring any surveillance or breaches and communicating regularly with faculty leadership.

Committee members suggested that use cases would be helpful in demonstrating to faculty how EDR software is used. Throughout the year, local computing committees consulted with or made efforts to consult with divisional CISOs and CIOs about campus cybersecurity plans.

Artificial Intelligence

UCACC learned about the UC administration's interest in creating a UC-based AI infrastructure to develop and centralize systems for high performance computing. There are models from other universities, including in Florida and Massachusetts, of centers that connect people and increase resource availability within a region or system.

In the spring, Chair Ilya Brookwell shared a statement from a group he is part of that is supported by the UC Humanities Research Institute (UCHRI) and that is looking critically at UC's intention for AI growth. Shared subsequently with CIO Van Williams, the statement's signatories note that AI development will require significant investment, engineering, and oversight, and that UC has both the opportunity and the responsibility to shape how AI serves educational priorities and to set a standard for ethical technological integration. The statement includes five principles, including support for interdisciplinary experimentation, inclusion of humanities and humanistic expertise in decision-making, protecting data privacy, ensuring transparency, and maintaining active stewardship.

Additional Business

Canvas Learning Management System Breach – In May, Instructure, the maker of Canvas, the University's learning management system, experienced a data breach that impacted thousands of users worldwide. The service was temporarily unavailable to the UC community at a crucial time at the end of the semester (for UC Berkeley and UC Merced) as the problem was resolved. UC's IT leaders sought faculty input through the UCACC chair, who sits on the CIO Council. UCACC members were asked to provide input into how faculty and students were dealing with the temporary loss of access to Canvas and on short- and long-term consequences.

Research Data Management at UCSF – Associate Chief Information Officer for Research at UCSF Mandy Terrill joined the April UCACC meeting to talk about UCSF's infrastructure support for researchers that includes tools, computing environments, subsidized storage, and staff. AI and machine learning have brought exponential growth in computing needs to the campus and have led to a reshaping of priorities. UCSF IT administrators are encouraged to interact regularly with researchers and get input for any project. As a member of systemwide administrative groups, Terrill was optimistic that working together as a system would have benefits for UC in obtaining economies of scale and consistency of tools across the campuses in areas including data storage, standardization of research IT, and partnerships with industry partners.

Cybersecurity Training - An effort to find a new digital risk training module was cancelled after a failed search; meanwhile, IT staff are working on a simulator to teach how to avoid phishing-type attacks

Systemwide IT Procurement – Senior Manager for IT Strategic Sourcing Roshni Pratap joined UCACC's October meeting to provide an update on the licensing agreement between UC and Adobe Creative Cloud that provides significant discounts and to ask for help in spreading the word.

Vendor Risk Assessments – UC's Central Risk Unit released a new risk assessment methodology that will give campuses a guide for performing vendor risk assessments. A new compliance tool will expedite systemwide vendor and enterprise risk assessments by determining if an assessment has already been done and just needs to be customized.

Research Data Security – UCOP has convened a Research Data Security workgroup to review UC locations’ experiences with research cybersecurity and framework compliance (e.g., CMMC, NSPM33, NIH, etc.). Workgroup members have discussed operational challenges, compliance practices and efforts, ideas for collaboration, and general research cybersecurity program status around the UC system.

Systemwide and Campus Updates: UCACC devoted part of each regular meeting to discussing systemwide issues as reported by Academic Senate leadership and reports from campus representatives on individual campus activities and concerns. The committee uses a shared Campus IT Governance Structures chart (shared via Google docs) to track faculty involvement in campus IT governance at each campus. This year a column was added to capture campus committees with oversight for Information Security/Privacy.

REPRESENTATION

UCACC Chair Ilya Brookwell served as a Senate representative to the CIO Council and the Cyber-Risk Governance Committee (CRGC). Chair Brookwell also served as an *ex officio* member of the University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communications (UCOLASC). UCSF representative Duygu Tosun-Turgot served as the Academic Senate liaison to the UC Artificial Intelligence (AI) Council.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

UCACC is grateful for the contributions made by the consultants and guests who attended meetings in 2025-26, including:

- Trevor Finneman, UC Legal Principal Counsel
- Kate Miffitt, Chief Digital Experience and Engagement Officer, UCOP
- Roshni Pratap, Senior Manager for IT Strategic Sourcing, UC Procurement Services
- Monte Ratzlaff, UC Cyber-Risk Program Director and Interim UC Chief Information Security Officer
- Mandy Terrill, Associate Chief Information Officer for Research, UCSF
- Judy Thai, Director of Application Engineering
- Michael Wegmann, IT Strategic Sourcing Manager
- Van Williams, Chief Information Officer and Vice President for Information Technology Services

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

Ilya Brookwell, Chair (UC Riverside)
 Lisa Yeo, Vice Chair (UC Merced)
 John Kubiadowicz (UC Berkeley)
 Jeremy Mason (UC Davis)
 Iftekhar Ahmed (UC Irvine)
 Gregory Leazer (UCLA)
 Yiwei Wang (UC Merced)
 Cathy Lussier (UC Riverside - fall and alternate)
 John Franchak (UC Riverside - winter and spring)
 Barry Grant (UC San Diego)
 Duygu Tosun-Turgut (UC San Francisco)
 Christopher Kruegel (UC Santa Barbara)
 Jerome Fiechter (UC Santa Cruz)
 Ahmet Palazoglu, Academic Council Chair (*Ex Officio*)
 Susannah Scott, Academic Council Vice Chair (*Ex Officio*)
 Joanne Miller, Committee Analyst



ACADEMIC COUNCIL SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON LAB ISSUES ANNUAL REPORT 2025-26

The Academic Council Special Committee on Lab Issues (ACSCOLI) was established by the Academic Council to provide broad-based Senate oversight of UC's relationship with the National Laboratories – Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL), Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL), and Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL, also called the Berkeley Lab). ACSCOLI advises the University on general policies relating to the National Laboratories, which includes the dispersal of UC's share of net fee monies, policies that affect the lab science management, and the quality of science being performed at the labs. ACSCOLI has also been involved in evaluating the benefits of UC's continued participation in the management of the labs, expansion of UC lab management, and stimulating closer connections between lab staff, faculty, and students.

ACSCOLI met three times during 2025-2026 academic year. All meetings were held via videoconference. This report provides highlights of the committee's discussions throughout the year.

OFFICE OF THE UC NATIONAL LABORATORIES

UC is the prime contractor for the management and operation of Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL). The University is a partner in the Lawrence Livermore National Security (LLNS), LLC, which manages Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL), and in Triad National Security, LLC, the partnership that manages Los Alamos National Laboratory (LANL). LLNS and Triad are overseen by the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), an agency within the U.S. Department of Energy. The office of the UC National Laboratories (UCNL) coordinates this work for the University.

At each ACSCOLI meeting, UCNL Vice President June Yu provided updates about significant lab activities, personnel changes, operations, safety and security, scientific strength, UC/lab collaborative programs, and any modification to operating contracts. She kept the committee apprised of federal activities that might impact the labs, including research security concerns, budget changes, adjustments to DOE priorities, and inspector general audits. As reported to the Board of Regents in January, all labs received "excellent" or "very good" performance evaluation ratings from the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) and the National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA). Weaker areas for each lab continue to be in infrastructure and facilities.

UC LAB FEES RESEARCH PROGRAM

- ***Multi-Campus Grant Opportunities***

Executive Director for National Laboratory Programs Alan Wan updated the committee on two Lab Fee sponsored programs. *AI Science at Scale* initially selected three proposals and then added one more for a total of four funded projects. Using a similar process, in the fall, the *UC Initiative for Fusion Energy* selected two teams – one led by UCSD and the other by UC Irvine – that will each receive grants of \$4 million over three years.

- **Re-envisioning Lab Fees Research Investment Program**

As UCNL assumes responsibility for the administration of the Lab Fees Research Program (LFRP), VP Yu formally asked ACSCOLI for input into a re-envisioning of the program in a way that would best leverage UC's investment and build ongoing strategic research partnerships. ACSCOLI was asked to review a preliminary set of desired attributes that would characterize a re-imagined fee investment mechanism. These included such non-assailable qualities as strategic focus, systemwide orientation, agility, scalability, efficiency, and accountability. VP Yu noted that ACSCOLI's feedback will play an important role in shaping UCNL's development of options for a future fee investment program. In the spring, ACSCOLI sent a response to VP Yu that included considerations for how a re-envisioned mechanism would align with the UC's mission and the Academic Senate's role in systemwide research programs, and produce systemwide benefits for research, education, and workforce development at the labs.

In its response letter, ACSCOLI noted the 2006 statement of the Assembly of the Academic Senate, which declared that the *"Academic Senate shall have a substantial role in advising the President on the dispersal of UC's share of fee monies associated with UC's role in any lab-management contract, either directly or through an LLC. This should include advising on selected research areas and methods of collaboration in research of mutual interest to the labs and UC. These fees should support specific scientific and technical projects at the labs as well as synergistic scientific and technical activities at UC."* ACSCOLI provided suggestions for the selected attributes and proposed adding "focus on talent development" to ensure that training of research professionals was included.

In addition to providing input on desired attributes for a re-imagined fee investment mechanism, ACSCOLI posed possible future uses for UC Lab Fees monies and noted the importance of regular and timely consultation with the Academic Senate as ideas are developed and refined. VP Yu has said that she will convene a small task force of administrators, national lab personnel and at least one Senate member to review the initial feedback and develop a plan.

The Research Grants Program Office at UCOP will continue to manage existing awards, which will conclude in three years.

EXPANSION OF UC'S LAB MANAGEMENT PORTFOLIO

ACSCOLI was updated at each meeting on the status of the UC-led bid to take over the management contract for the Frederick National Laboratory for Cancer Research. A final contract award decision is expected by the end of 2026.

MASTER AGREEMENTS FOR JOINT APPOINTMENTS

ACSCOLI discussed joint appointments only briefly this year, although there is still keen interest. Some campus administrators are more supportive than others, and the complication of involving both research vice chancellors and vice presidents for academic personnel presents obstacles. For those campuses that have them, joint appointment agreements are used to cover issues such as liability and intellectual property.

SENATE LEADERSHIP UPDATES

ACSCOLI was joined at each meeting by the Academic Senate chair and/or vice chair who provided updates about the work of the Senate. Even though ACSCOLI members do not report back to committees at the campuses, these regular updates to standing and special committees help faculty members have a broader view of the University.

REPRESENTATION AND REPORTING

- ACSCOLI Chair Lorenzo Valdevit participated in numerous meetings of national laboratory boards and committees throughout the year:
 - LLNS Board of Governors S&T Committee Meeting – LLNL (Observer) – Sep 2025
 - LBNL Advisory Board Meeting (ex officio Board member) – Sep 2025
 - LLNS Board of Governors S&T Committee Meeting – LLNL (Observer) – April 2026
 - LBNL Advisory Board Meeting (ex officio Board member) – Apr 2026 (virtual)
 - Triad STE Committee Meeting – LANL (Observer) – May 2026 (virtual)
 - LANL Materials Capability Review (Observer) – Jun 2026
 - Triad STE Committee Meeting – LANL (Observer) – August 2026
- On June 24, ACSCOLI Chair Lorenzo Valdevit joined the Academic Council meeting to give an update on ACSCOLI's discussions over the past year.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ACSCOLI wishes to acknowledge the contributions of its consultants and guests who joined meetings this year:

- Kathleen Erwin, Executive Director, Research Grants Program Office
- Deborah Motton, Executive Director for Research Policy and Analysis (RPAC)
- Neil Narang, Interim Associate Vice President for National Labs
- Alan Wan, Executive Director for Laboratory Programs
- June Yu, Vice President for the National Laboratories

Respectfully submitted,

Lorenzo Valdevit, UCI, **Chair**

Barry Barish, UCR

Q. Jason Cheng, UCR

Timothy Fisher, UCLA

Darrell Long, UCSC

Youngho Seo, UCSF

Stephen Wilson, UCSB

Robert Powell, UCD, Chair of the Triad LLC Science, Technology, and Engineering Committee and
Member of LLNS Board of Governors

Ramesh Rao, UCORP Representative, Ex-Officio

Rena Zieve, UCPB Representative, Ex-Officio

Ahmet Palazoglu, Academic Council Chair, Ex-Officio

Susannah Scott, Academic Council Vice Chair, Ex-Officio

Joanne Miller, Academic Senate Committee Analyst



**University Committee on Academic Freedom
2024-2026 Annual Report**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

Under Senate Bylaw 130 and consistent with [Bylaw 40](#), the University Committee on Academic Freedom shall (Am 28 May 2003): Study and report to the Assembly upon any condition within or outside the University that, in the committee's judgment, may affect the academic freedom of the University and its academic community. (Am 15 Jun 71; Am 23 May 1996; Am 28 May 2003)

Executive Summary

The University Committee on Academic Freedom (UCAF) addressed issues brought by its members affecting instructors' and students' academic rights, shared governance, and the functioning of UCAF. A third group of topics involved discussion of UCAF's internal functioning and its place in the governance system.

ISSUES OF ACADEMIC FREEDOM

Release of community members' personally identifiable information

The Committee discussed the release of certain information about particular individuals to the federal government. In the fall this followed charges of anti-Semitism. It was noted that UC Berkeley had been especially criticized for doing so, which was an ironical consequence of UCB being unique among the divisions in having informed the individuals involved.

The Committee sent a report to the Academic Council urging that UCOP update its policies around the storage and transmission of personally identifiable information. The basic rules are decades old, predating many technical advances that increase the threat to privacy. Such releases may be legally required, but it should be standard policy across campuses to inform the persons involved.

Systemwide review of guidelines on faculty discipline, classroom and extramural speech

The Committee hosted UCPT Chair Susan Amussen and Vice Chair Michael Robinson-Dorn, who chaired work groups on policies regarding faculty discipline policies and faculty

member's speech in the classroom and extramurally on controversial issues. The Committee gave feedback on discipline policy changes, and these were approved by the Regents in January.

More related to academic freedom was clarifying, for the sake of those who might censor themselves inappropriately, what controversial classroom and extramural speech is permissible. Brian Soucek, a past UCAF chair, visited the Committee and circulated an FAQ on this topic. A final document will be circulated for review in the fall 2026 and UCAF will be asked to assess it.

Faculty input at the start of disciplinary investigations of instructional matters

When an instructor states an opinion or takes an action that provokes opposition, a crucial question is whether it is educationally relevant to the subject of the course or otherwise inappropriate. On many campuses this judgement moves immediately to an administrator who may be unfamiliar with the course's subject. An alternative is that a relevant faculty member be involved right at the beginning to advise on this aspect. The Committee discussed how this might be implemented.

Response to a range of federal government actions

Members discussed political vetoes on research funding, the position of non-citizen faculty with regard to international travel, UC's provision for legal aid for violations of academic freedom, and faculty input in academic-freedom-related negotiations with the federal government.

Increasing local awareness of academic freedom protections

Members shared a number of ideas that they had implemented or were planning to implement on their campuses. Examples are offering that an academic freedom committee member speak at a department meeting, a cross-campus know-your-rights meeting for new faculty, a campus-wide questionnaire on faculty opinions and experiences around academic freedom, or explanations of academic freedom by the instructor to students at the start of a controversial course. Associated documents were posted on the UCAF website.

Expanding Opportunities Report on Chemistry, Mathematics, and The Future of STEM at UC

This 2025 UCOP document discusses new proposals for designing "gateway courses" on STEM topics, aimed at increasing the number of students who take them successfully and continue in that area. The Committee discussed issues relating to faculty's right to design their courses and teaching methods and decided to take the subject up again.

Controversial outside speakers, campus protests

It was reported that on some campuses police generate after-incident reports that name names even when no offenses were committed. Another issue was techniques of mediation at campus meetings. In some places, Dartmouth, in particular, the decision to intervene is in the hands of a group trained in conflict resolution.

ISSUES AROUND UCAF'S FUNCTIONING

Communication among UCAF and the divisional committees

UCAF meetings regularly share local developments, including threats to academic freedom on the ten campuses and new responses to these threats. While the agenda of UCAF meetings include these campus reports, communication in the reverse direction is less regular. It was urged that it be a regular practice that divisional committee representatives reporting these developments, both developments at UCAF and on other campuses.

UCAF's year-to-year continuity

Almost all members of UCAF are on for only one year. This is scarcely enough time to acquaint oneself with important aspects of our issues on the system level, identify important academic freedom issue on that level, work out a proposal, and interact with Academic Council on any implementation. Often members come up with good ideas but it is too late to see them through.

A response is to increase the number who stay on UCAF for more than one year. It was recognized that more continuity may require some increase in membership.

More frequent, possibly shorter, UCAF meetings

During the past year UCAF met four times. Many proposals take more than one meeting, and the two-to-three month gap between meetings decreases the committee's feeling of direction. Ideas generated and points made are forgotten.

Another reason for more frequent meetings is that some academic freedom issues call for a prompt response. Also threats to academic freedom have varied over the years, and they are currently numerous.

The typical meeting lasted four to five hours with a short lunch break; if needed, the duration could be reduced.

UCAF representation on, or systematized communication with, the Academic Council

As threats to academic freedom sharply increased, the Academic Council responded, an example being its October 3, 2025, letter to President Milliken on the federal government's demands for personally identifiable information. The letter was strong and to the point, but it has to be noted that there was no UCAF involvement even though it focused on the committee's subject.

UCAF members are selected, and self-selected, for their interest and knowledge about the topic. Brian Soucek (Law, Davis), a past chair, just published an excellent book on institutional neutrality, and other members, e.g., in philosophy or political science, have professional interests related to the topic. Our members in science or engineering often see academic freedom issues that social science or humanities faculty would miss.

Academic freedom is a more intricate subject than many faculty recognize. Those on UCAF and divisional committees often commit themselves to learning more about it and to keeping up with national developments. Our members are a resource, but over the year communication between UCAF and the whole Council has been limited and indirect. Given the issue's increased importance, some remedy should be considered.

Systematic provision of legal advice to UCAF

Academic freedom often involves legal issues, but unlike some faculty committees, UCAF's roster does not deliberately include a lawyer. Joshua Meltzer, UCOP's Managing Counsel for Education Affairs and Governance, visited our meeting to discuss this issue. An effective path might be to invite a legal expert to participate in certain chosen discussions. The Chair and Vice Chair might communicate with them beforehand to ask them if they see legal items on the agenda.

Acknowledgements

The Committee gives special thanks to Senate Executive Director Monica Lin, Senate Chair Ahmet Palazoglu, Senate Vice Chair Susannah Scott, Senate Analyst Fredye Harms, and other guests who advised us over the year.



UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL
ANNUAL REPORT 2025-2026

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP) had four videoconferences during the Academic Year 2025-2026 to conduct business with respect to its duties as outlined in Senate Bylaw 135, which are to consider general policy on academic personnel, including salary scales, appointments and promotions, and related matters. The issues that UCAP considered this year are described briefly as follows:

RESPONSES TO EXTERNAL CIRCUMSTANCES

UCAP spent considerable time consulting with the Office of the President regarding practices and policies that were required to change in order to remain in compliance with new state and federal laws and expectations. Another significant topic was how UC can best adapt to the changing labor landscape in California since evolving and fast-moving labor-related issues continue to impact research and teaching outcomes, as well as job classifications and expectations.

- Senate Bylaw 55 (Departmental Voting Rights) was raised throughout the year since Professors of Teaching are not automatically granted departmental voting rights, but any given department may grant such rights on an annual basis by a majority vote. Given the transfer between series, and the growth in the use of the title overall, UCAP reconsidered submitting amendments to SBL 55 that would automatically grant such rights. A previous effort of this amendment failed narrowly at the Academic Assembly in 2024. Next year's UCAP will continue deliberations regarding submission of an updated amendment packet for SBL 55.

UCAP partnered with the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) and the University Committee on Diversity and Equity (UCODE) to learn more about campus practices for evaluating faculty performance through the lens of Achievement Relative to Opportunity (ARO) principles which calibrate performance delivery with performance opportunity, such as the loss of grant funding or other circumstances.

UCAP's chair and vice chair represented the group on the joint Senate-administration ad hoc University Committee on Adaptations to Disruptions + (UCAD+). This group followed the Senate-only UCAD and considered UCAP-related topics such as how changes to research foci and productivity vis-a-vis new federal funding options and expanded ARO usage in reviews could influence academic advancement. The final UCAD+ report and recommendations will be sent for systemwide review in Fall 2026.

OTHER ISSUES AND ADDITIONAL BUSINESS

In response to requests for formal comments from the Academic Council, UCAP submitted views on the following:

- Proposed revisions to APM 015, 016 (Faculty Code of Conduct)
- Proposed revisions to APM 036 (Employment)
- Proposed revisions to the President's Policy on Research Misconduct Allegations
- UCAD's interim report

CAMPUS REPORTS

UCAP devoted part of each regular meeting to a discussion of issues facing local committees including workload and backlog.

UCAP REPRESENTATION

UCAP Chair Abu-Ghazaleh represented the committee at meetings of the Academic Council and the Assembly of the Academic Senate and served on the Provost's Academic Planning Council (APC).

COMMITTEE CONSULTATIONS AND ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

UCAP benefited from regular consultation and reports from Monica Varsanyi, Vice Provost, Faculty Affairs and Academic Planning (FAAP); Amy K. Lee, Deputy Provost, Systemwide Academic Personnel (SWAP); and Kelly Anders, Executive Director, SWAP.

UCAP regularly consulted the Academic Senate Chair Ahmet Palazoglu and Vice Chair Susannah Scott about issues facing the Senate and UC.

Respectfully submitted,
Naul Abu-Ghazaleh, Chair
Angela Gelli, Vice Chair
Christine Parlour, UCB
Gina Bloom, UCD
Mona Lynch, UCI
Linda Demer, UCLA
Ajay Gopinathan, UCM
Xinping Cui, UCR
Lynn Russell, UCSD
Ashish Raj, UCSF
Geoffrey Raymond, UCSB
Greg Gilbert, UCSC
Kenneth Feer, Principal Policy Analyst

BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS (BOARS) ANNUAL REPORT 2025-2026

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) met ten times in Academic Year 2025-2026 (including two in-person meetings) to conduct business with respect to its duties as outlined in [Senate Bylaw 145](#): to advise the President and Senate agencies on the admission of undergraduate students and the criteria for undergraduate status. The major activities of BOARS and the issues it addressed this year are outlined briefly, as follows:

Annual Report to the Regents on Undergraduate Admissions Requirements and Comprehensive Review

BOARS' annual *Report to the Regents on Undergraduate Admissions Requirements and Comprehensive Review* discusses freshman and transfer application, admission, and enrollee outcomes under comprehensive review for the years 2021–2025; first-year UC performance outcomes for students who entered UC in fall 2025; efforts by BOARS to enhance the transfer admission path and to ensure that admitted nonresidents compare favorably to California residents; a summary of each UC campus's comprehensive review process; and challenges associated with the future of the referral guarantee. The report notes BOARS' concern that annually increasing enrollment expectations from the state, absent funding for additional academic facilities, could have deleterious educational outcomes in the long run.

- ***Policy on Augmented Review in Undergraduate Admissions***

[Regents Policy 2110](#) outlines guidelines and criteria for an additional review of select applicants who fall in the margins for admission, but whose initial application yields an incomplete picture of their qualifications or presents extraordinary circumstances that invite further comment. It outlines three types of supplemental information a campus may request from up to 15% of applicants in a given admissions review cycle: 1) a questionnaire inviting the candidate to elaborate on special talents, accomplishments, extraordinary circumstances, and their school/home environment; 2) 7th semester grades; and 3) up to two letters of recommendation. The policy states that campuses may solicit letters only from applicants selected for augmented review, applicants considered for admission by exception, or applicants given a special review in other specific situations.

Nonresident Admission

- ***Annual Systemwide Compare Favorably Report***

BOARS issued its annual "Compare Favorably" report on 2025 nonresident admissions. The annual report summarizes systemwide and campus outcomes for the policy, focusing on comparisons of high school grade point average (GPA), first-year UC GPA and persistence for residents, domestic nonresidents, and international nonresidents for each campus. The report notes that based on those limited measures, the University is largely meeting the standard on a systemwide basis, although outcomes vary on specific campuses. The report emphasizes that GPA is a narrow, imperfect measure for the assessment, given campuses' use of 13 comprehensive review factors in admission.

Credit by Examination

College Board's Validation of Evidence-Based Standard Setting

In 2024-2025, BOARS began contemplating the changes made by the College Board in 2022 to how Advanced Placement (AP) exams are scored. In November 2025, College Board representatives

joined BOARS to explain the new Evidenced-Based Standard Setting (EBSS) process and respond to a set of questions, which were provided in advance, from BOARS, the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP), and the University Committee on Preparatory Education (UCOPE). Based on the information the College Board provided about the EBSS methodology, BOARS, UCEP, and UCOPE agreed to bring the new scoring process to the attention of UC faculty so departments and programs can make reasoned decisions about how AP scores are used for credit by exam. The [joint memo](#) was submitted to Academic Council and transmitted to the divisions in January 2026.

International Baccalaureate Programs

The deliberations regarding the College Board's AP exams prompted BOARS, in collaboration with UCEP and UCOPE, to learn more about the high school International Baccalaureate (IB) programs. In December 2025, representatives from the IB Organization (IBO) provided BOARS with details about the programs. Following this presentation, the IBO requested that BOARS reconsider its 2003 decision to not grant credits for IB Standard Level (SL) exams which led to an April 2026 visit with an IBO representative who shared in-depth analyses focused on a comparison of the content and skills assessed by SL exams relative to A-Level and AP exams. In June, the majority of BOARS members agreed to allow SL exams to be submitted by the IBO and considered by UC for admissions eligibility and credit towards UC degrees. A [memo from BOARS](#) and the policy was transmitted to the divisional admission committee chairs in June 2026.

Policy on the Review of AP, IB, and A-Level Exams for Credit

In October 2023, the Office of Undergraduate Admissions at the UC Office of the President (UCOP) asked BOARS to develop a systemwide policy on using credit by examination to fulfill A-G requirements, including in cases where a student may not have taken an associated course. A small subcommittee began working on a policy during the 2023-2024 academic year. However, in 2024-2025, upon learning about the changes made by the College Board to its scoring process for AP exams, members determined that there were serious questions that fell beyond the scope of the subcommittee's draft policy. The chairs of UCEP and UCOPE joined the March 2026 BOARS meeting for a discussion about what should be included in a standardized evaluation rubric to be used by faculty to assess the exams. A draft policy on reviewing AP, IB, and A-Level exams for credit was reviewed by BOARS in May 2026 and finalized and unanimously approved in June, and [the policy](#) was subsequently transmitted to the divisional admission committee chairs.

New Scoring Scale for the Test of English as a Foreign Language iBT (TOEFL iBT)

In January 2026, the Office of Undergraduate Admissions reported on the new scoring scale the Educational Testing Service was implementing for the Test of English as a Foreign Language internet-based test (TOEFL iBT) and provided an analysis on the impact of changing the scale from 0-120 to an updated 1-6 scale. BOARS debated how best to adjust UC's minimum score of 80 for demonstrating English language proficiency for undergraduate admissions in a way that aligns with the new scoring framework and maintain consistency in expectations for English language proficiency across approved examinations, noting that an individual campus can set a higher minimum score. This topic was discussed again in February and in March BOARS unanimously approved setting UC's new minimum at 4.5. A [memo](#) announcing the revised systemwide minimum score was disseminated to the divisions in April 2026.

Dual Enrollment

In January, BOARS received an overview from Riverside County Office of Education's Executive Director of College Career Readiness, Catalina Cifuentes, of how dual enrollment is currently working in California high schools. Dual enrollment enables high school students to take

community college courses, taught by college professors, at their high school campus. Executive Director Cifuentes presented data which shows that increasing numbers of students are taking advantage of dual enrollment opportunities. Despite the state's significant investment in the dual enrollment, the program is not necessarily leading to greater post-secondary enrollment. Members of BOARS were dismayed by the absence of a standard for as well as oversight of dual enrollment activities and have concerns about how this program is contributing (along with credit by exam) to students receiving significant credit for coursework completed before they arrive at UC. Therefore, this is a topic that will be the focus of future discussions.

Transfer Issues

Associate Degree for Transfer Program

Assembly Bill 1291 (2023), which went into effect on January 1st, 2024 required UCLA to implement the Associate Degree for Transfer (ADT) program and for UC to designate at least additional five campuses to implement the program by the 2028-2029 academic year. The program will prioritize the admission of students who have completed an ADT at a California Community Colleges' (CCCs) campus and meet the requirements of the UC transfer curricula for a participating campus. In January 2026, BOARS met with representatives of UCLA's ADT Task Force who described the campus's approach to developing its ADT pilot program which launched in the 2026-2027 academic year. Using the UCLA model as a guide, BOARS developed a systemwide guidance document that provides recommended steps for developing ADT pilot program goals and identifying selected majors at undergraduate campuses across the UC system in order to comply with Assembly Bill 1291. BOARS' [Systemwide Guidance for Developing ADT Pilot Programs](#) was distributed to the divisions in April 2026.

Transfer Subcommittee

A small subcommittee of BOARS was established this academic year to address issues related to transferring from the CCCs to UC. The subcommittee was tasked with responding to the 2024 California State Auditor's recommendation to streamline and simplify lower-division course requirements for transfer applicants in the most popular UC majors by developing and begin implementing a plan by September 2026 for reviewing and updating the UC Transfer Pathways. Over the course of several months, the subcommittee identified several strategies for addressing the Auditor's recommendation including developing ADTs with specific CCCs and aligning the UC Transfer Pathways as closely as possible with the Transfer Model Curriculum (TMC) to help simplify the options and the requirements for major preparation for students while maintaining faculty expertise in their disciplines. The subcommittee's report was unanimously approved by BOARS on July 10th and subsequently transmitted to the Office of Undergraduate Admissions for formal submission to the Auditor by September 2026. Next year, UCOP expects to begin collecting data about the rationales for programs that opted not to accept the ADTs or TMCs.

Academic Preparation and Undergraduate Admissions Policies

In 2024-2025, members of BOARS frequently remarked on the decline in preparedness in writing and math within some students across the UC, and this theme continued at the start of the 2025-2026 academic year. In February 2026, the committee was joined by UCSD divisional Senate representatives to discuss the [UCSD Senate-Administration Workgroup \(SAWG\) on Admissions Report](#) which outlined faculty concerns about math preparation and high school grade inflation and suggested the need to reinstate the use of standardized tests for UC admissions. This was followed by a March presentation of data on the Smarter Balanced Assessment and a preliminary discussion regarding changes to systemwide policies to address math preparation.

Special Charge and Policies and Partnerships Roadmap on First Year Admissions

During the March 2026 meeting, BOARS considered the proposed Special Charge from Senate Leadership that called for BOARS to devise a plan for a review of current UC undergraduate admissions policies and an investigation of college preparation issues. From mid-March through the end of May, including during the BOARS videoconferences, members worked on the draft Policies and Partnerships Roadmap on First Year Admissions. The Roadmap was finalized and approved unanimously by BOARS on June 5th but the members subsequently voted to rescind approval of the Roadmap on July 10th. Members cited three major concerns as the justification for introducing a motion to rescind their June 5th vote: the Special Charge was issued to BOARS in March 2026 without formal endorsement by Academic Council; the timeline embedded within the Roadmap resulted in limited flexibility for BOARS to issue recommendations during 2026-2027 within a quicker or shorter timeframe if necessary; and concerns about legitimate feedback, input, and concerns that surfaced from internal and external stakeholders since BOARS' prior approval of the Roadmap on June 5th. After the majority of BOARS rescinded the June 5th vote to approve the Roadmap, on July 22nd Academic Council approved [two Charges to BOARS on standardized testing and the A-G framework](#).

Consultation with State Board of Education President

State Board of Education President Darling-Hammond joined BOARS in October 2025 for a discussion that touched on the A-G framework and preparing students for the workforce. In November 2025 and December 2025, President Darling-Hammond sat in on the College Board and IBO presentations as well as the February 2026 presentation by Graduate, Undergraduate, and Equity Affairs on UC's outreach and educational partnerships as well as educator programs which are directly related to the goals BOARS has for enhanced engagement with the K-12 sector.

Joint Meetings with the UC Admissions Directors and Enrollment Management Leads

The campus admissions directors and associate vice chancellors for admissions and enrollment management joined BOARS in December 2025 and May 2026 to discuss the College Board's EBSS process; UCSD's SAWG on Admissions report; the creation of ADTs; dual enrollment and credit by exam; and the Policies and Partnerships Roadmap on First Year Admissions.

Other Business and Briefings

Systemwide Review Items: In response to requests for formal comment from the Academic Council, BOARS issued comments on the proposed revisions to Senate Bylaw 192 and Senate Regulations 636 and 76.1.

Campus Reports: BOARS set aside a portion of each meeting for updates from faculty representatives about issues being discussed on their admissions committees and campuses. These briefings touched on a wide range of topics including issues related to transfer students; local holistic review processes; math preparation and placement; and enrollment trends.

Senate Leadership Briefings: The Academic Senate chair and vice chair attended a portion of each BOARS meeting to report on Academic Council and Regents meetings, and other systemwide issues of particular interest to the committee or of general interest to faculty. These briefings included updates on the state budget; labor negotiations; and the UC Adaptations to Disruptions Plus Task Force.

Graduate, Undergraduate, and Equity Affairs and Institutional Research and Academic Planning: Graduate, Undergraduate, & Equity Affairs (GUEA) provided regular briefings throughout

the admissions cycle on applications, admissions, and statement of intent to register outcomes. The GUEA consultants also provided valuable information about transfer policies, initiatives, and legislation; admissions messaging; feedback from counselor conferences; and the common course numbering (CCN) project. Institutional Research and Academic Planning presented an analysis of the relationship between AP coursework and UC admissions and completion and an analysis of Honors courses (including AP, IB, UC-transferrable college courses, and UC-certified honors courses), and AP vs. IB courses. In January 2026, the Vice President for GUEA, Yvette Gullatt, joined BOARS to provide an overview of UCOP K-12 outreach programs.

BOARS Representation

BOARS Chair Volz represented the committee at meetings of the Academic Council, the Assembly of the Academic Senate, the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS), the ICAS California General Education Transfer Curriculum Standards Review Committee, and the CCN Council. In addition, BOARS Chair Volz participated in ICAS' Legislative Day in Sacramento on March 12, 2026 as well as testified at an Assembly Budget Subcommittee 3 on Education Finance Hearing in Sacramento on April 29, 2026.

Acknowledgements

BOARS collaborated closely with UCOP and benefited from regular consultations with Han Mi Yoon-Wu, Associate Vice Provost and Executive Director, Undergraduate Admissions, Graduate, Undergraduate and Equity Affairs, (GUEA); Chase Fischerhall, Director, Director, A-G & Transfer Articulation, GUEA; Angelica Moore, Director, Undergraduate Admissions, Policy and Communications, GUEA; and Liz Terry, Manager of Admissions Analytics, Undergraduate Admissions, GUEA. BOARS also received valuable support and advice from Institutional Research and Academic Planning Director Tongshan Chang and Senior Institutional Research and Planning Analyst Matt Reed, who provided the committee with critical analyses and data related to the *Report to the Regents on Undergraduate Admissions Requirements and Comprehensive Review* as well as the *Compare Favorably* analyses.

Respectfully submitted,

David Volz, Chair (R)	Michael Stryker (UCSF)
Nicholas Mathew, Vice Chair (B)	Vanessa Woods (UCSB)
Gustavo Manso (B)	Luca de Alfaro (SC)
Leah Hibel (D)	José Aguilar (Graduate Student Representative)
Andrea De Vizcaya Ruiz (I)	Matthew Shahmaram (Undergraduate Student Representative)
Kelly Kay (LA)	Ahmet Palazoglu, Chair, Academic Senate
Joel Spencer (M)	Susannah Scott, Vice Chair, Academic Senate
Manu Sridharan (R)	Brenda Abrams, Principal Policy Analyst
Adrian Ioana (SD)	



**COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON GRADUATE AFFAIRS
Annual Report 2025-26**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

Consistent with the [Bylaw 40](#) , the Committee shall: (Am 28 May 2003)

1. Advise the President of the University and all agencies of the Senate regarding the promotion of research and learning related to graduate affairs.
2. Establish basic policies and procedures for coordinating the work of the various Graduate Councils and Divisions.
3. Recommend to the Assembly minimum standards of admission for graduate students [see [Bylaw 311.C.1](#)].
4. Act for the Academic Senate in the approval of new programs for established graduate degrees, including the joint doctoral degrees with campuses of the California State University.
5. Review proposals from Graduate Councils for the establishment of new graduate degrees that require approval of the President, to whom The Regents have delegated authority of approval, and submit recommendations thereon to the Assembly [see [SOR 110.1](#) and [Bylaw 116.C](#)]. (Am 24 May 00)
6. Review standards and policies applied by Graduate Councils, and policies concerning relations with educational and research agencies.
7. Approve UC graduate courses as system-wide courses to be listed in Divisional catalogues. (En 10 Nov 04)

Executive Summary

The Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs completed a full year of academic program review, graduate policy development, consultation with Senate leadership, and systemwide graduate education oversight.

Program Approvals

During the 2025-26 academic year, CCGA approved 18 program proposals and returned one to its campus. Ten of the approved proposals were Self-Supporting Graduate Professional Degree Programs (SSGPDPs), and one proposal had PDST (Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition). Five additional proposals will carry over to the 2026-27 year, due to being received late in the academic year.

Programs Decided Upon During the 2025-26 Year

Campus	Program	Date Received	Date Approved	SSGPDP
UCM & UCSF	Dual Degree BS/MD *	05/20/25	11/05/25	No
UCR	Online Master of Business Administration (OMBA) *	06/24/25	03/04/26	Yes
UCD	En Route MA to the PhD in Education *	06/23/25	10/08/25	No
UCI	En Route MA – Criminality, Law, and Society *	07/17/25	01/07/26	No
UCD	Online Master of Engineering in Water Resources Engineering *	08/13/25	02/24/26	Yes
UCD	Online Master of Engineering in Sustainable Transportation *	08/13/25	12/03/25	Yes
UCI	4+1 in Biological Sciences	06/27/25	12/03/25	No
UCSF	MS in Regulatory Science and Digital Innovation (RSDI)	08/25/25	06/03/26	Yes
UCD	Online Masters of Engineering in Biomedical Engineering for Healthcare Technologies	08/28/25	03/04/26	Yes
UCM	MS and PhD in Life and Environmental Sciences	09/12/25	01/07/26	No
UCSD	Master of Design (MDes)	11/07/25	05/06/26	Yes
UCSC	MA in Anthropology	Returned to Campus	—	
UCR	4+1 BS/MS in Mathematics	12/10/25	02/04/26	No
UCSB	Online Master of Engineering and Technology Leadership	02/02/26	04/08/26	Yes
UCB	Master of Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning (MAIML)	01/16/26	06/03/26	Yes
UCD	Resubmission: Online Master's in Preventive Veterinary Medicine and One Health (eMPVM)	02/12/26	07/01/26	Yes
UCLA	Master of Population and Data Science	03/18/26	07/01/26	Yes
UCI	Master of Epidemiology (One Year)	03/11/26	05/16/26	No
UCD	Master's in Education and Teaching Credential	04/29/26	06/03/26	No

* Carried over from 24-25

The committee worked diligently with campuses and faculty throughout the year to help them craft and improve proposals that would meet the University's expectations of excellence. With the exception of proposals that carried over from the 24-25 year, **the average time for a proposal turnaround, from agenda placement to approval, was 3.6 months.**

Proposals to be Carried Over to 2026-27

Program	Date Received	Status	SSGPDP
Master of Instructional Design	04/24/26	On Hold Until October	Yes
Online MS in AI and Data Science	05/18/26	On Hold Until October	Yes
4+1 BS/MS in Data Science and Statistics	06/08/26	On Hold Until October	No
Nurse Anesthesia Concentration Within the DNP	06/09/26	On Hold Until October	Yes
Online Master of Engineering in Aerospace Engineering	06/25/26	On Hold Until October	Yes

Year Highlights

- Completed review of the inaugural CSU doctoral proposal cycle and identified recommendations for future reviews.
- Provided input and consultation to the UCAD Plus efforts.
- Approved handbook revisions governing 4+1/hybrid programs, access and opportunity language, and guidance for online synchronous and asynchronous graduate education.
- Engaged on graduate enrollment, labor agreements, AI, doctoral education reform, accreditation, international students, and the California Master Plan.
- Considerable attention to UAW negotiations and their impact on graduate education and research.
- Discussion of declining doctoral and international student enrollment trends.
- Review of federal actions involving accreditation, research funding, visas, and student aid.
- Discussion of legislative proposals affecting the California Master Plan, CSU doctoral authority, admissions policy, and research funding.

Acknowledgements

CCGA is grateful to have had valuable input from - and exchange with - these consultants and guests over the past year: Katherine S. Newman, Provost; Pamela Jennings, Associate Vice Provost for Graduate Studies; Todd Greenspan, Executive Advisor, Academic Planning and Policy; Carmen Corona, Director of Academic Planning and Policy; Courtney Wilson Institutional Research and Planning Analyst; and Council of Graduate Deans representative Peter Biehl (UCSC). Thanks, too, to Academic Council Chair Ahmet Palazoglu, Vice Chair Susannah Scott, and Senate Executive Director Monica Lin. Tremendous thanks to our

student representatives - Ryan Manriquez and Rebecca Ruiz – who participated actively, offering campus-level perspectives on graduate education challenges and concerns.



**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES
ANNUAL REPORT 2025-26**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

Responsibilities and Duties

Pursuant to Senate Bylaw 150, the University Committee on Committees (UCOC) oversees the appointment of chairs and vice chairs for each of the standing committees of the Assembly; oversees the nomination of Senate members to serve on ad hoc or ongoing joint Senate-Administration committees and task forces; and sends letters of appointment to all appointees specifying term of the appointment and committee charge. In 2025-26, UCOC met three times via Zoom and once in person. Major issues and actions taken are reported below.

Appointment of Chairs and Vice Chairs of the Senate's Standing Committees

While being mindful of balance and representation among campuses, UCOC reviewed and approved chairs and vice chairs for standing committees for 2026-27. All chair and vice chair positions for systemwide committees were filled as of June 15th.

Appointment of members of Standing Committees for 2026-27

The ten divisions nominated representatives to standing committees and to the Assembly of the Academic Senate. UCOC subsequently issued appointment letters to each division specifying the term of appointment and information regarding service on systemwide committees. UCOC made six new appointments to the Editorial Committee and filled the membership for UCRJ.

Appointment of members of Senate committees, subcommittees, or task forces within the systemwide Academic Senate

- Academic Council Special Committee on Lab Issues (ACSCOLI)
- Systemwide Reserve Privilege and Tenure (P&T) Pool

Selection of Senate Representatives to Other Committees

UCOC is responsible for selecting Senate representatives to various groups that are proposed by the President, Provost, or other senior administrators. UCOC nominated or reviewed nominations of representatives to serve on joint administration-Senate task forces, external councils, and other groups in 2025-26. These included:

- UC San Francisco Chancellor Stewardship Review Committee
- UC Santa Cruz Chancellor Stewardship Review Committee
- Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee
- Systemwide Library Facilities Board
- UCDC Academic Advisory Committee
- UCDC Governing Council

Oliver Johnson Award for Distinguished Leadership

UCOC reviewed nominations from the divisions for the 2026 Oliver Johnson Award for Distinguished Leadership in the Academic Senate and forwarded two names to the Academic

Council, pursuant to the award's guidelines. The Academic Council selected UC San Diego Professor Robert Horwitz and UCLA Professor Adrienne Lavine.

Senate Service Engagement and Compensation

UCOC maintains a shared spreadsheet for documenting the ways that Senate divisions engage new faculty and reward faculty for Senate service. This year, UCOC members reviewed compensation practices at the divisions and discussed how to share the information with Senate offices and local committees on academic personnel. At the last meeting of the year, UCOC members discussed a draft memo from Chair Oliver Arnold describing the range of recognition for service at the divisions and offering broad recommendations for best practices. Members agreed that Chair Arnold would send the memo to the Academic Council at the beginning of the 2026-27 academic year, along with a more detailed report that would be sent to UCAP for distribution to divisional Committees on Academic Personnel.

Systemwide Senate Leadership Updates

UCOC received regular updates from the Academic Senate chair and vice chair about important issues facing the faculty and the University.

Respectfully submitted:

Oliver Arnold, UCOC Chair (UCB)
 Anne McKnight, UCOC Vice Chair (UCR)
 Mary Ann Smart (UCB)
 Victoria Cross (UCD)
 Bogi Andersen (UCI)
 LaToya Baldwin Clark (UCLA)
 Victor Muñoz (UCM)
 Anthea Kraut (UCR)
 Teddy Cruz (UCSD)
 Marta Margeta (UCSF)
 Rich Wolski (UCSB)
 Dean Mathiowetz (UCSC)
 Ahmet Palazoglu (Academic Council Chair, ex-officio)
 Susannah Scott (Academic Council Vice Chair, ex-officio)
 Joanne Miller (Committee Analyst)



UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON DIVERSITY AND EQUITY

2025-26 ANNUAL REPORT

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Diversity and Equity met five times during the 2025-26 academic year. In accordance with its duties as outlined in Senate Bylaw 140, UCODE consulted on general policies bearing on diversity, and equity for academic personnel, students, and academic programs. Highlights of the committee's discussions and actions are described below.

Name Change

Completing a process begun in the 2024-25 academic year, UCODE proposed changes to the committee's name and charter. After discussion, the result was a change in committee name and charter that removed the phrase "Affirmative Action" from both. These changes were discussed by Academic Council in December and endorsed in January, and approved by Assembly in February.

University Committee on Adaptation to Disruptions (UCAD)

In October, UCAD discussed the interim report of the UCAD workgroup. Members expressed concern about tension between system and division control of efforts to mitigate the effects of disruptions such as the federal cancellation of many research grants. They focused on equity concerns of various stresses across the university. Chair Holmquist served on one of the subcommittees of the successor work group, a joint Senate-Administration University Committee on Adaptation to Disruptions Plus (UCAD Plus).

Consultation with the Office of Faculty Affairs and Academic Programs (FAAPP)

Throughout the year, UCODE met and consulted with Monica Varsanyi, Vice Provost, Faculty Affairs and Academic Programs as well as Deputy to the Vice Provost Patricia Osorio-O'Dea, who updated the committee on various matters:

- The Advancing Faculty Diversity (AFD) Program funds have been moved to The Early Career Research Excellence grant program.
- The President's Postdoctoral Fellowship Program (PPFP) remains in place. There had been confusion over whether hiring waivers could be used for the program. The specific PPFP carve-out was eliminated, but Targets of Excellence (TOE) waivers can be applied to PPFP hires.
- Mortgage Origination Program (MOP) loans will now use outside funding to preserve liquidity.

- There is an Expressive Activities Task Force focusing on academic freedom and concerns about the intrusion of extramural speech in the classroom. Systemwide review of their report will begin in September.
- The University Committee on Adaptation to Disruptions Plus (UCAD Plus) continued the work begun by the Senate UCAD group.
- The Performance of Undergraduate Degree Programs (PUDP) task force investigated quality education in both online and in person instructional formats. A follow-on group focused on online education will determine what metrics can measure quality in both formats, and what infrastructure needs for online education would be needed to meet quality needs.

Consultation with Graduate, Undergraduate, and Equity Affairs (GUEA)

Vice President and Vice Provost Yvette Gulatt met with UCODE a number of times over the year. She discussed changes to APM 036 and forcefully noted that the UC follows all state and federal laws. She noted that search waivers can be used for PPFP hires, and reminded committee members to consult stakeholders before making changes to programs that support students, faculty, or staff.

Consultation on the President's Post Doctoral Fellowship Program

Mark Lawson, Director of the President's Post Doctoral Fellowship Program (PPFP), briefed the committee on ongoing issues around the program. Members expressed concern about differing implementation of TIE waivers across the system. PPFP scholars achieve tenure at rates higher than other faculty hires, and ten years after hiring, they have a higher rate of retention at the UC. If the UC focuses on late-career exceptional hires, it risks not building a new generation of faculty.

Achievement Relative to Opportunity (ARO) Report

Last year, the committee, along with the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW), the University Committee on Academic Personnel (UCAP), and the University Committee on Privilege and Tenure (UCPT), began investigating how ARO principles were applied on their campuses, whether there was variation among schools and disciplines, and communication practices around ARO both to faculty and to privilege and tenure committees. This year, the information was compiled and a report explaining the project and laying out best practices for implementing ARO across the UC was sent to Council, **which endorsed the report but asked for further discussion before recommending the principles be added to the Academic Personnel Manual (APM).**

Reports and Recommendations

UCODE provided systemwide review of the following items:

- In November, comments on the interim report of the University Committee on Adaptation to Disruptions (UCAD).
- In December, management consultant review for Proposed Technical Revisions to APM 710 and 758.
- In December, proposed Presidential Policy on Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct.
- In January, a review of a Sample Civil Rights Syllabus Statement.
- In May, Senate Review of the Tribal Lands Workgroup Report.

- In June, a letter regarding Systemwide Policies Applying to University of California Police Department (UCPD).

In addition, the committee sent letters or reports on the following issues:

- In November, a letter to the Academic Council expressing concern about removal of hiring waivers for the PPFP.
- In January, a letter to the Academic Council asking for approval of changes to the committee's name and charter.
- In April, a letter to the Academic Council expressing concern about lack of consultation for new guidance regarding hiring waivers for the PPFP.
- In June, a report to the Academic Council on the application of Achievement Relative to Opportunities (ARO) principles by division.

UCODE members served on the University Committee on Adaptation to Disruptions Plus, and the committee welcomed and valued input from the following UCOP and campus consultants and guests over the past year: Sarah Ackerman (alternate, San Francisco), Vice Provost Monica Varsanyi, Deputy to the Vice Provost Patricia Osorio-O'Dea, Vice President for Graduate and Undergraduate Affairs and Vice Provost for Equity, Diversity and Inclusion, Yvette Gullatt, Director, President's Post Doctoral Fellowship Program Mark Lawson, Academic Council Chair Ahmet Palazoglu, Academic Council Vice Chair Susannah Scott, Student representatives Alexis Garcia (undergraduate) and Rebecca Ruiz (graduate).

Respectfully submitted,

Kristen Holmquist (Chair, Berkeley)
 Gareth Funning (Vice Chair, Riverside)
 Adrienne Correa (Berkeley)
 F. Javier Arsuaga (Davis)
 Kristina Uban (Irvine)
 Raphael Rouquier (Los Angeles)
 Sean Malloy (Merced)
 Esra Kurum (Riverside)
 Ross H. Frank (San Diego)
 William Martinez (San Francisco)
 Ruth Hellier (Santa Barbara)
 Dev Bose (Santa Cruz)
 Stefani Leto (Analyst)

**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE
ON
EDUCATIONAL POLICY
2025-2026 ANNUAL REPORT**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) met by videoconference 15 times in Academic Year 2025-2026 to conduct business with respect to its duties as outlined in [Senate Bylaw 170](#) and in the Universitywide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, and Research Units (the “[Compendium](#)”). The major activities of the committee and the issues it addressed this year are outlined briefly, as follows.

Global Language Network

Over the course of the 2025-2026 academic year, UCEP monitored the launch of the Global Language Network (GLN), an initiative organized by humanities deans across the system and UC Online at the UC Office of the President with the goal of supporting the instruction of and expand access to less commonly taught languages for undergraduates by leveraging online delivery, cross-campus enrollment, and systemwide coordination. In November, the GLN Task Force chair, UCLA Dean of Humanities Alexandra Stern, met with the committee to explain the rationale for the network and the implementation phases. Although Vice Chair Duque represented UCEP on the Task Force, accurate details about the status of initiative remained largely unavailable throughout the year.

Degree Plus Pilot Initiative

UCEP learned about the Degree Plus Pilot Initiative following announcements by Provost Katherine Newman to the Board of Regents and the Academic Council. On June 1st, the committee received a thorough overview of the pilot’s implementation from UC System Vice Provost of Faculty Affairs & Academic Programs, Monica Varsanyi. Provost Newman created the Degree Plus initiative, which is being piloted at UCSB’s and UCSD’s extension programs, to provide students with an add-on to their UC degree by combining job-oriented or skills-focused certificate programs with a paid internship. UCEP members have concerns about the degree of oversight divisional Senates have over campus Extension programs and whether the quality of extension courses will be assessed.

Systemwide Course Review and Approval Policy

In 2024-2025, UCEP considered how systemwide courses are defined and the committee drafted a document that includes the definition along with language from 2011 and 2014 guidelines. This year, the committee further refined what qualifies as a systemwide course and decided against extending the policy to systemwide programs because such programs are not clearly defined. The [policy](#) was finalized and approved in March 2026.

Credit by Exam

College Board’s Validation of Evidence-Based Standard Setting

In 2024-2025, the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) began contemplating the changes made by the College Board in 2022 to how Advanced Placement (AP) exams are scored. In November 2025, UCEP’s chair joined a BOARS meeting for a presentation by College Board representatives on the new Evidenced-Based Standard Setting (EBSS) process. Based on the

information the College Board provided about the EBSS methodology, BOARS, UCEP, and UCOPE agreed to bring the new scoring process to the attention of UC faculty so departments and programs can make reasoned decisions about how AP scores are used for credit by exam. The [joint memo](#) was submitted to Academic Council and transmitted to the divisions in January 2026.

Policy on the Review of AP, IB, and A-Level Exams for Credit

UCEP, BOARS, and the University Committee on Preparatory Education (UCOPE) each review exams for different purposes and recommend cut scores. The chairs of UCEP and UCOPE joined the March 2026 BOARS meeting to discuss what should be included in a standardized evaluation rubric to be used by faculty to assess the exams. BOARS drafted a policy on reviewing AP, International Baccalaureate, and A-Level exams for credit with input from UCEP and UCOPE. The [joint policy](#) was finalized by BOARS in May 2026 and was subsequently transmitted to the divisional admission committee chairs.

New UCEP White Paper

In February 2026, began contemplating the development of a new UCEP white paper after observing that a variety of initiatives (e.g., the Global Language Network, the Degree Plus Pilot, and the UC Adaptation to Disruptions Task Force) touch on questions of educational quality, teaching modalities, evaluation and learning outcomes, and the impact of different factors such as disruptions and artificial intelligence. Vice Chair Duque facilitated a series of discussions about learning outcomes, quality of education, and metrics of success with particular attention to how that might vary across modality, subject area, or location. The goal is to produce a white paper that can serve as a common framework that allows the Senate to engage in debates and decision-making with administrators. The vice chair drafted a prospectus and shared a problem statement with the committee on June 15th and work on the white paper will continue in 2026-2027.

UC Online

This year, UCEP stayed abreast of multiple efforts in which UC Online has a central role including the Global Language Network, the Assessment Center Consortium (ACC), and the Equity Lab Project. In March 2026, the committee was joined by the chair of the ACC Task Force, Tricia Bertram Gallant, and the executive director of UC Online, Rolin Moe, for an update on the Network. UC Online convenes and staffs the ACC and engages with leadership around the system to facilitate the development of the assessment centers for students taking online courses. During this meeting, Executive Director Roe reported on the now defunct Equity Lab Project partnership between UC and the National Education Opportunity Network. UCEP members have concerns about UC Online being increasingly asked to support initiatives beyond its original role in online course development and cross-campus enrollment, especially when these efforts lacked sufficient Senate consultation. In April, Executive Director Moe met with the committee to review UC Online's 2024-2025 annual report and members had questions about the quality of the data the program is able to provide. In June, UCEP's chair shared the committee's concerns with Academic Council which were conveyed to the Vice Provost of Graduate, Undergraduate, and Equity Affairs, Yvette Gullatt, in a [July memo](#).

New Federal Accreditation Rules

In May, UCEP received a briefing from Institutional Research and Academic Planning (IRAP) on the U.S. Department of Education recent release of new draft regulations that would change higher education accreditation processes by loosen the standards for who can be an accreditor and the requirements for being accredited. The draft new regulations also place the accrediting agencies

under tighter federal control raising concerns about issues such as self-governance and educational policy decisions. In June, UCEP held a discussion in Executive Session with the representatives of the Western Association of Schools and Colleges Senior College and University Commission (WSCUC), including President Maria Toyoda, to learn more about the proposed changes. The committee will monitor developments related to the proposed changes in 2026-2027.

Student Mental and Physical Well-Being

In the fall, members raised concerns about the mental and physical well-being of students and the committee was eventually joined in June by UCOP's Director of Student Mental Health and Well-being, Genie Kim, and UCLA's Director of Counseling & Psychological Services, Nicole Presley, to learn about the services available on UC campuses. Members appreciated the overview of services but found that the presentation did not include information about the utilization or effectiveness. Therefore, UCEP will continue consulting with the Student Mental Health and Well-Being unit at UCOP in an effort to attain more granular facts.

Other Issues and Additional Business

In response to requests for formal comment from the Academic Council, UCEP issued reviews of the following:

- UCAD Task Force's Interim Report
- The Presidential Interim Policy for the University of California's Use of Online Program Management Companies
- The Proposed Presidential Policy IMT-1300 Information Technology Accessibility
- UCD's Proposal for the Simple Name Change of the School of Veterinary Medicine
- Systemwide Senate Review of Proposal to Establish a Systemwide Academic Senate Committee on Climate Change and Sustainability
- Systemwide Senate Review of Proposed Revisions to Senate Bylaw 192 and Senate Regulations 636 and 761
- UCSD's Proposal to Rename the School of Computing, Information and Data Sciences
- UCLA's Request for Amendment to Regulation A-304.A.3 and Repeal of Regulations A-304.A.4 and 452 Variances

UCEP touched on a variety of other issues related to the business of the Academic Council, Academic Assembly, the Intersegmental Committee of the Academic Senates (ICAS), and the work of campus Committees on Educational Policy/Undergraduate Councils.

UCEP Representation

UCEP Chair Sugar represented the committee at meetings of the Academic Council and Academic Assembly. Chair Sugar also participated on the Provost's monthly budget briefing calls; the Academic Planning Council; ICAS; and the ICAS California General Education Transfer Curriculum Standards Review Subcommittee. Darlene Francis (UCM) represented UCEP on the UC Online Advisory Council; by Lily Hoang (UCSD) on the UC Washington Center's Academic Advisory and on the UC Education Abroad Advisory Board; and by Maia Young (UCI) and Tanner WouldGo (UCSC) on the Performance of Undergraduate Degree Programs Task Force.

Committee Consultations and Acknowledgements

UCEP benefited from consultation with and reports from: Todd Greenspan, Executive Advisor, Academic Planning and Policy Development, Institutional Research and Academic Planning (IRAP);

Carmen Corona, Director, Academic Planning and Policy, IRAP; Ethan Savage, Academic Planning and Policy Analyst, IRAP; and Rolin Moe, Executive Director, UC Online, Graduate, Undergraduate and Equity Affairs. In addition, UCEP consulted with the Academic Senate chair and vice-chair, who updated the committee on issues facing the Senate.

Respectfully submitted,

Catherine Sugar, Chair (LA)
Darlene Francis (B)
Gerardo Con Diaz (D) (Winter and Spring)
Jeffrey Maloy (LA)
Ruhi Khan (R) (October)
Lily Hoang (SD)
Guiliana Perrone (SB)
Onuttom Narayan (SC) (Spring)
Ahmet Palazoglu ((D), Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*)
Susannah Scott ((SB), Vice Chair, Academic Senate, *Ex Officio*)
Brenda Abrams, Principal Policy Analyst

Jason Duque, Vice Chair (SB)
David Kyle (D) (Fall)
Maia Young (I)
Susan Varnot (M)
Gene Brewer (R)
Nailyn Rasool (SF)
Tanner WouldGo (SC) (Fall and Winter)
Azalea Han (Undergraduate Student)



**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON FACULTY WELFARE (UCFW)
2025-26 ANNUAL REPORT**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

Under [Senate Bylaw 175](#), the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) considers and reports on matters concerning the economic welfare of the faculty, including salaries, benefits, insurance, retirement, housing, and conditions of employment. UCFW met nine times during the 2025-26 academic year, and the major actions and discussions of ongoing issues are highlighted in this report.

UCFW has two semi-permanent task forces with separate memberships and with particular expertise in: (1) the University of California Retirement System (UCRS) including its policies and its investments (the Task Force on Investment and Retirement, TFIR); and (2) the University's health plans for employees and retirees (the Health Care Task Force, HCTF). These task forces monitor developments and carry out detailed analyses of questions and issues in their respective areas and report back to UCFW for further action. UCFW is indebted to the extraordinary commitment and skills of our task force leadership, Jill Hollenbach (TFIR) and Vickie Mays (HCTF). These two task forces spend a great deal of time in consultation with systemwide Human Resources (HR). The Faculty Affairs and Academic Programs (FAAP) and Systemwide Academic Personnel (SWAP) offices, and others from the Office of the President, also regularly attend UCFW meetings and lend their expertise to our discussions. We are indebted to these consultants, and they are individually acknowledged at the end of this Report.

FACULTY WELFARE

Responding to External Circumstances:

UCFW spent considerable time discussing the impacts of and response options to volatile and unique external circumstances, including new state laws and regulations, changes to federal funding sources, and the political climate of the day.

- Chair Bales participated in the joint Senate-administration ad hoc University Committee on Adaptations to Disruptions Plus (UCAD+), which followed the Senate-only University Committee on Adaptations to Disruptions (UCAD) and was convened to advise both the faculty and the administration on how to proceed during these challenging times. Issues considered include emergency research funding options, academic evaluation guidance, and changes to the academic structure of the University. The final UCAD+ report and recommendations are expected to be submitted for systemwide review in Fall 2026.
- The best way to incorporate or institutionalize the principles underlying “achievement relative to opportunity” were discussed both with UCAD+ and at UCFW. Some feel that the APM should be amended to include specific reference to ARO principles which would empower faculty to include them in merit and review statements and packets. Others feel that clear guidelines would be easier to adopt and adapt while offering the same level of empowerment. UCFW and other Senate groups will continue this discussion next year.

- The impacts to faculty teaching, research, and service of proliferating academic labor contracts were frequently discussed. Zero-sum funding in grant environments, decreasing graduate student enrollment, and their overlapping impacts on faculty merit and review practices remain in flux as the landscape continues to change at a rapid pace. The potential impacts of greater unionization among clinical faculty and other ranks at the general campus further complicate these considerations, as well as those related to faculty governance and oversight roles.

Housing:

UCFW met with representatives from the Office of Loan Programs to learn about funding changes to the Mortgage Origination Program and to share members' concerns about the program's on-going ability to benefit new and junior faculty given the California housing affordability situation and insurance requirements.

CASH COMPENSATION

Total Remuneration:

Senate representatives to a Total Remuneration Advisory Committee pressed repeatedly for a methodology that was parallel to previous total remuneration studies in order to allow for longitudinal analysis. The Provost suggested that the study include two analyses - one that incorporated the Senate's recommended methodology and one that reflects the standard commercial methodology typically used by the external consultant contracted to conduct the study. The final study findings are expected to be shared in Fall 2026.

HEALTH AND WELFARE BENEFITS

- HCTF continued to examine the models and approaches utilized in operationalizing the University health benefits, particular approaches for rate setting for various health plans. HCTF worked with both HR and UC Health to begin to identify difficulties in access and accessibility of health care with a focus on campuses without medical enterprises and will continue this work throughout the next year. HCTF is charting a course with UC Health and HR on long term strategies to address the market increases in health care costs and how to manage those with a focus on increasing the value of that care in the face of rising costs.
- HCTF representatives participated in consultations with HR, searches for new contract providers for dental benefits, evaluation of a Medicare Advantage program within the UC, and were invited to sit on a selection panel for an HR search.

RETIREMENT ISSUES

- TFIR had previously recommended that the default option in the 2016 UCRS tier be changed to Pension Choice, the defined contribution plan, as it best matches the behavior patterns of those who have defaulted in the past. This year, the administration rejected the proposal, noting that the current structure was approved by the IRS and holds the University in a stable financial position. Now, TFIR will advocate for improved educational materials for new hires.
- UCFW and TFIR continued to advocate for improved communications for employees recalled to active duty after retirement, with a focus on benefits coverage continuity and tax implications.
- TFIR proposed that the University raise the assumed rate of return for UCRS and other investments from 6.75% to 7.25% based on their analysis of nearly 100 years of returns

data. UCFW endorsed the proposal, as did the Academic Council, who then shared it with the administration. Further action may occur in Fall 2026.

- UCFW and TFIR discussed data breaches and related security issues involving the Retirement Administration Service Center.

OTHER POLICY ISSUES AND SYSTEMWIDE REVIEWS:

UCFW also opined on the following proposals and topics:

- APM 015, 016 (Faculty Code of Conduct)
- APM 036 (Employment, General)
- The importance of continuing gender affirming care
- Systemwide Policies Applying to the University of California Police Department
- Presidential Policy IMT-1300 Information Technology Accessibility
- Presidential Interim Policy for the UC's Use of Online Program Management Companies
- Presidential Policy on Allegations of Research Misconduct
- Senate Bylaw 140 (University Committee on Diversity and Equity)
- Presidential Policy on Sustainable Practices
- UCAD's Interim Report
- Report of the UC Tribal Lands Workgroup

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

UCFW is indebted to its consultants and guests, without whom the committee's work could not be done:

Academic Affairs: Provost Katherine Newman;

Faculty Affairs and Academic Programs: Vice Provost Monica Varsanyi;

Systemwide Academic Personnel: Deputy Provost Amy Lee; Executive Director Kelly Anders

UC Health: Executive Vice President David Rubin;

Human Resources: COO Rachael Nava; Vice President Dianna Henderson; Senior Executive Director Benefits Programs and Strategy Maynard Jenkins; Senior Director of Health and Welfare Benefits Susan Pon-Gee; Executive Director of UC Self-Funded Health Plans Laura Tauber; Retirement Program Services Executive Director Hyun Swanson;

Office of the Chief Financial Officer: CFO Nathan Brostrom;

Office of the Chief Investment Officer: CIO Jagdeep Bachher; Director of Defined Contributions Products Marco Merz.

We are particularly grateful for the involvement, support and guidance from the Senate leadership, Chair Ahmet Palazoglu and Vice Chair Susannah Scott, as well as the advice and perspective provided by Senate Executive Director Monica Lin. Finally, the committee acknowledges Kenneth Feer, who has provided able staff support.

Respectfully yours, UCFW 2025-26:

Karen Bales, Chair

Alexander Sher, Vice Chair

J. Keith Gilles, UCB

Janet Foley, UCD

Ben Lourie, UCI

Reza Ahmadi, UCLA

David Rouff, UCM

Salman Asif, UCR
Julie Marek Bykowski, UCSD
Alon Witztum, UCSF
Matthew Helgeson, UCSB
Yat Li, UCSC
Jill Hollenbach, TFIR Chair
Vickie Mays, HCTF Chair
Joel Dimsdale, CUCEA Chair (ex officio)
David Kleinfeld and Zoran Nenadic, UCRS Advisory Board Faculty Representatives (ex officio)



**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION
Annual Report 2025-26**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

Charge of the Committee

According to Academic Senate Bylaw 182, and consistent with [Bylaw 40](#), the University Committee on International Education (UCIE) should fulfil the following roles in systemwide governance:

1. Consider and report, in consultation with other Academic Senate committees, on matters of international education and engagement referred to the Committee by the President of the University, the Academic Council, the Assembly, a Divisional or any Senate Committee. (Am 28 May 2003)
 - a. Report to the Academic Council and other agencies of the Senate and confer with and advise the President and agencies of the University Administration on matters concerning international engagement.
 - b. Initiate policy recommendations regarding international engagement programs and the status and welfare of international students and scholars at UC.
 - c. Evaluate and advise on UC's international service learning or experiential learning programs, except programs whose authorization and supervision is performed independently by the campuses.
2. Provide Continuing review of the Education Abroad Program and its policies. (EC 28 May 2003 and 8 June 2023)
 - a. Consult with the UC Education Abroad Program (UCEAP) on future program development, including modification of the programs of existing Study Centers, establishment of new Study Centers, and disestablishment of UCEAP Programs. (Am 28 May 2003)
 - b. Represent the Senate in the selection of Study Center Directors. (Am 28 May 2003)
 - c. Maintain liaison with the Council of Campus Directors. (Am 28 May 2003)
 - d. Advise the UC Education Abroad Program Associate Vice Provost and Executive Director on all matters of international education. (Am 28 May 2003)
 - e. Have the responsibility for the final academic review of new programs after the first three years, and for regular reviews of all programs every ten years or as conditions may require. (En 4 May 89; Am 4 Jun 91; Am 28 May 2003)
 - f. Authorize and supervise all courses and curricula in the UC Education Abroad Program (Am 2 Dec 71; Am 4 May 89; Am 28 May 2003)

Executive Summary

During 2025-26, UCIE provided oversight of UCEAP academic quality, approved new international programs, reviewed existing programs, monitored international student policy developments, and advanced discussions on language learning, access, affordability, internships, research opportunities, and global engagement. International Education Priorities: Language learning, visa policy developments, student support, housing, access, affordability, and academic quality remained recurring themes.

UCEAP Growth and Strategy

UCEAP enrollment continued to grow with increases in summer and fall participation, expansion of internships, research opportunities, STEM offerings, and strategic planning initiatives. Reviews emphasized language preparation, advising, mental health support, academic integration, program capacity, and course articulation. Enrollment growth remained strong despite visa and geopolitical challenges. A strategic visioning process, organizational restructuring, and creation of a Chief Academic Officer role advanced institutional priorities.

Language Learning and Global Competence

- UCIE devoted significant attention to language preparation and language-study participation.
- The committee consulted with the Global Language Network and explored the future of language learning within international education.

Programs Approved During the Year

- Paris Dauphine University (PSL)
- Monash University
- Barcelona Summer Internship
- Tecnun Summer Engineering Research
- Costa Rica Summer Sea Turtle Conservation
- Summer Russian Language

Key Accomplishments

The committee approved reviews of Japan, France, Chile, Hong Kong, South Korea, Nordic Countries, and Summer Global Internship programs. The committee also met with the systemwide Deputy Provost of Academic Personnel regarding concerns about H1-B visas and with senior UCOP staff regarding NRT and international students.

Looking Ahead

Future priorities include expanding access to study abroad, investigating language pathways, broadening opportunities in Africa and the Global South, monitoring immigration and visa developments, improving affordability, and continuing rigorous academic oversight of UCEAP programs.

Acknowledgements

Thanks to Academic Council Chair Ahmet Palazoglu, Vice Chair Susannah Scott, and Senate Executive Director Monica Lin. Thanks also to our UCEAP partners: Executive

Director Dan Waite, Director of Academic Development Sarah Abraham, and Associate Deans Peter Graham and David Lopez-Carr.



UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON LIBRARY AND SCHOLARLY COMMUNICATION

2025-26 ANNUAL REPORT

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

According to Senate Bylaw 185, the University Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (UCOLASC) shall:

1. Advise the President concerning the administration of the libraries of the University in accordance with the Standing Orders of The Regents and issues related to innovations in forms of scholarly communication.
2. Perform such other appropriate duties as may be committed to the Academic Senate by proper authority.

UCOLASC met three times in 2025-26 via videoconference.

Consultation with the California Digital Library

UCOLASC met with representatives from the California Digital Library (CDL) at each meeting. Associate Vice Provost and Executive Director Günter Waibel provided regular updates on CDL budget issues as well as emerging federal policy changes and requirements. UCOLASC and the CDL have had a cooperative relationship, and the committee has supported many CDL priorities.

- The CDL budget faced challenges this academic year, receiving budget cuts and having to eliminate staff positions.
- The Online Archive of California (OAC), in existence since 1995, was relaunched on a new platform this year. This service aggregates collection descriptions of California libraries, archives, historical societies, and museums.
- The OA Forward coalition brings worldwide chief negotiators together to discuss how to advance publisher based open access. All UC campuses and UCOP have signed an Expression of Interest (Eol) in advancing OA through publisher negotiations. UC values and strategies (represented by UCOLASC statements) are strongly represented in the statements shared at the recent conference.
- CDL is partnering with the Big Ten Academic Alliance and Lyrasis on a research project funded by a grant from the Gates foundation to do a landscape analysis of Diamond OA publishing in the United States.

Council of University Libraries Updates

Budget cuts at all campuses are impacting libraries, and cuts to the shared collections budget are felt throughout the system. Libraries have banded together to roll out varying mitigation strategies, but core library holdings and services capacity is being cut.

Updates from Office of Scholarly Communication Working Groups:

Project Transform (PTWG)

Project Transform continued to update UCOLASC about their work to secure author rights through negotiating transformative publishing contracts and noted that publishers representing approximately 55 percent of all UC articles have signed transformative agreements. Noncommercial topics including retention of Artificial Intelligence/Text and Data Mining rights are also in negotiation. Securing UC researcher's rights to use computational methods on licensed content has been a key feature of this year's negotiations. Negotiations with the American Chemical Society have taken up much of the team's attention this year.

Conflict between Federal Funders and Publisher Policies

UCOLASC was asked to provide a letter of support to the negotiating team and the UC Libraries, not only specifically rejecting the recent response of publishers to federal mandates but also emphasizing how the position of the negotiation team aligns directly with the principles outlined in the 2018 Declaration of Rights and Principles to Transform Scholarly Communication.

Advancing OA Monographs for UC Authors

Miranda Bennett, Director of Shared Collections, CDL, reported on the effort to support UC authors in making their monographs open access. The project will provide steady funding for publishers and steady expense levels for libraries. The third pilot program with Oxford University Press is fully focused on backlist titles, aiming for a total of 100 new open books this year.

The team is also involved with Big Ten Books, part of the Big Ten Academic Alliance, and UC libraries provided funding for 34 UC-authored books to be opened. In addition, new workflows that can be replicated and make these works available with eScholarship. The program enhances the UC reputation as a force within open access publishing. The steering committee charged with advancing this work will compare recommended strategies versus current investments and determine which strategies to pursue further.

eScholarship

eScholarship has a repository function and is a publisher of diamond open access journals. All materials collected under the auspices of the UC Open Access policies are deposited in and available via eScholarship. Similarly, all theses and dissertations written by UC graduate students are submitted to ProQuest and displayed in eScholarship. A new function of the repository is to provide access to the UC-authored OA Monographs pilot.

eScholarship publishes more than 90 UC-affiliated journals. eScholarship journals represent a wide range of disciplines, especially humanities and social sciences which make up 50-70 percent of the output and includes undergraduate and graduate student-published journals.

Because the prestige of these journals rests with the editorial board, Promotion and Tenure committees need support in navigating a different kind of valuing for all these Diamond OA journals. The program is exploring various funding models including the newly launched Open Journals Collective, providing a potential path toward sustainable Diamond open access publishing.

Federal Data Management Planning

Federal policy requires that funded authors deposit their data in data management systems. Recent changes from both NSF and NIH to data management and sharing plans appear to be minor but have large implications. NSF Data management Plans will now be moving into a closed federal portal – currently with no API, though the community is advocating for open APIs and interoperability. The UC has a web application helping researchers create best practice data management plans called the DMP tool that serves as a communication tool between libraries and researchers, so that information and guidance could be delivered to researchers. The CDL and UCOLASC will continue to monitor changes to federal policy about data submission and work to preserve open APIs

UC Arts and Humanities OA Fund

The small-scale (300 articles) pilot of the UC Libraries Arts and Humanities Open Access Fund was launched in November 2026. This fund is managed by the library system and will fully cover fees for open access publishing by an eligible UC corresponding author (a UC-affiliated early career researcher, including students, postdocs, research staff, and pre-tenure faculty) in an eligible journal. Because transformative agreements are not possible with every single journal, this fund allows authors to choose open access by subsidizing the costs for eligible journals not covered by an existing transformative agreement.

Systemwide Library Facilities

The UC approach to shared library facilities is innovative as the approach prioritizes efficiency, sustainability, and effectiveness in managing these collections without ceding access, preservation, or stewardship. The governance structure is carefully constructed so that it continues as a shared resource, prioritizing active accessibility to the materials while the system moves from a regional structure to a system-wide one. A new full-time director of the Systemwide Library Facility, and Associate University Librarian, Shari Laster, will coordinate the transformation.

Other UCOLASC Issues:

Data Evaluation

The committee discussed how tenure and promotion evaluation of data and software contributions should be considered for advancement. A member provided a rubric, created by the Implementing

Data Evaluation in Academia Working Group (IDEA WG), which grew from a collaboration between Helios Open and Making Data Count. IDEA WG aims to provide resources for universities to standardize analysis of data and other open science contributions as scholarly work products for hiring and promotion. For example, one project goal is to modernize fields in standard CV-creating software to provide a reporting area for data and other open science work products. Another is to offer guidance for review committees on how to consider these products, thereby fostering more accurate evaluation of diverse faculty work in the promotion process.

Artificial Intelligence

UCOLASC spent much time in vigorous discussion of artificial intelligence (AI) and publishing. Members learned neither a closed publication nor a CC-BY-NC(-ND) license protect against commercial AI training on UC-authored work. Open access presents the most straightforward path to federal compliance but will generally not facilitate authors who seek revenue streams from their publishing activities. Members responded to the UC Academic Senate Workgroup on Artificial Intelligence final report and wrote letters supporting the Project Transform Negotiating Team's continued commitment to open access as they discuss contracts including AI provisions.

Consultation with Senate Leadership

Each meeting, UCOLASC received updates from Senate leadership on current concerns of the wider Senate as well as matters related specifically to the committee. Topics covered included:

- Topics from Assembly and Council meetings, including meeting with President Milliken.
- Federal government actions against the UC and ever-changing funding landscapes, including grant cancellations and restorations.
- The work of the University Committee on Adaptation to Disruptions (UCAD) and the following joint Senate-Administration UCAD-Plus Workgroup effort.
- The Performance of Undergraduate Degree Programs Task Force (PUDP), the successor to the 2023 -2024 Presidential Task Force on Instructional Modalities and UC Quality Education, which is of interest specifically to libraries.

Changes to Universal Guidance by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB)

In June, the OMB released proposed changes to universal guidance. UCOLASC responded, noting that the new policy prohibits use of federal research grant funds to pay for subscriptions, which would devastate the UC Library's journal subscription budget. Library costs are used to set indirect cost rates, and this might disallow payments to publishers. In addition, the policy disallows using federal grant funds for publishing fees, including open access fees. The UC has worked diligently to establish transformative agreements with publishers; this policy would disrupt this substantially.

Endorsements, Systemwide Reviews, and Letters of Support

UCOLASC wrote several letters and memos, and responded to systemwide review items:

- In November, a review of the Senate Adaptation to Disruptions Working Group Interim Report

- In November, a statement on 100% Open Access and Funder Compliance
- In February, a response to request for systemwide review of APM 015-016 and an update on faculty discipline revisions
- In February, a memo to the Project Transform Working Group amplifying a previous statement in support of open access publishing agreements, noting a federal mandate that all federally funded research articles be deposited in a public repository without any embargo period and calling on publishers to cooperate with this requirement.
- In March, a Statement on the UC Libraries Negotiations with Publishers Regarding Fair Use, Text and Data Mining, and Artificial Intelligence Usage Rights, sent to the Project Transform Negotiating Team and the Council of University Librarians
- In June, a review and response to the Academic Senate Workgroup on Artificial Intelligence Workgroup final report.
- In June, a letter to the Project Transform Negotiating Team, Project Transform Working Group, and the Council of University Librarians about 100% Open Access and Artificial Intelligence.
- In June, a letter to the Executive Director, Research Policy Analysis and Coordination, expressing concern over proposed changes to universal guidance by the OMB.

UCOLASC expresses gratitude to its regular consultants, student representative, and guests: Associate Vice President and Provost Günter Wqibel, CoUL Chair William Garrity, LAUC President Heather Briston, Director of Publishing, Archives, and Digitization Catherine Mitchell, Director of Shared Collections Miranda Bennett, Director of Systemwide Library Planning Danielle Watters-Westbrook, Assistant Director for Open Access Agreement Matthew Willmott,, Senior Project Manager Adrian Turner, University Librarian, San Diego Erik Mitchell, Associate University Librarian and Director of Systemwide Library Facilities, Shari Laster, James Steintrager, UC San Francisco, Rich Schneider, Undergraduate Representative Alice Parra Rios..

Respectfully submitted:

Abraham Stone, Chair
 Déborah Blocker, Vice Chair
 Jennifer LaFleur, Berkeley
 John Roberts, Berkeley
 Michael Foster, Irvine
 Alan Fiske, Los Angeles
 Christopher Ojeda, Merced
 Sholeh Quinn, Merced
 Joseph Genereux, Riverside
 Sebastian Salegh, San Diego
 Michael Oldham, San Francisco
 Teresa Shewry, Santa Barbara
 Michael Hance, Santa Cruz
 Stefani Leto, Analyst

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND BUDGET (UCPB)

ANNUAL REPORT 2025-26

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB) met ten times in Academic Year 2025-26 to conduct business pursuant to its duties to advise the President and other University agencies on policy regarding planning, budget, and resource allocation as outlined in [Senate Bylaw 190](#) and in the *University-wide Review Processes for Academic Programs, Academic Units, and Research Units* (the “[Compendium](#)”). UCPB served a vital role in tracking, analyzing, and advising on budget-related issues affecting the University of California system, as this year continued negative federal actions against the UC and ongoing uncertainty about state revenues. Through collaborative leadership and active campus engagement, the committee advocated for policies that promote transparency, sustainability, and equity.

UCPB actively responded to challenges facing the UC this year:

Graduate Student Funding

In response to a request from Vice Chair Scott, UCPB members investigated funding for graduate students in both STEM and humanities fields and produced a report outlining general cost concerns as well as average time to degree. The report was sent to Council; UCPB hoped that it would become part of a wider Senate conversation about graduate funding and funding sources for varying disciplines.

Athletics Funding

UCPB members requested information about athletics department budgets on their home campuses. The committee also consulted with CFO Brostrom about issues surrounding athletics funding, including changes to NCAA funding rules and recent literature relevant to athletics funding in higher education and various solutions proposed to address shortfalls in athletics funding.

When all information was received, UCPB compiled the data into a report showing sources of revenue and expenses for each campus’ athletic program. The report was shared with Council and the CFO. UCPB suggested that an inter-campus athletics funding task force be stood up next year to consider systemwide solutions for athletics funding challenges.

UCPB Response to the *Report of the Yale Committee on Trust in Higher Education*

In June and July, UCPB members, in response to a request from Academic Council Chair Palazoglu, read and responded to the Yale Report. They hoped to open a dialogue with the Academic Senate, rather than extracting policy suggestions or endorsing the report. UCPB discussed the perception of the UC within the state and higher education nationwide and hoped that their presentation and response to the report would provide areas for exploration for the UC.

Comments on Task Force on Investment and Retirement (TFIR) Pension Funding Proposal

In July, UCPB met with members of TFIR to discuss their proposal for the Regents to change the assumed rate for the UC Retirement Plan (UCRP), from the current 6.75 percent to at least 7.25 percent. They assert that the UCRP can sustain the level of asset drawdown it currently has without

relying on increases in the real value of contributions or transfers from STIP. Changing the assumed rate would yield roughly \$2B in savings and yet would not yield cash for core expenses because the Regents are not following their own Funding Policy. The policy contributions not made add to the UCRP's unfunded liability.

UCPB wrote a letter to Council strongly supporting TFIR's proposal, with the caveat that such a change should only happen in parallel with adherence to Regental Policy 5601 "Policy on University of California Retirement Plan Funding."

BUDGET, STATE RELATIONS, AND ADVOCACY

UCPB continues to appreciate the close supportive relationship the committee shares with the University's Chief Financial Officer, Associate Vice President for Budget Analysis and Planning, and Associate Director of State Government Relations. They joined UCPB each month to discuss the development of the 2025-26 University budget plan, increased costs facing the university, federal actions impacting the UC, and legislative developments.

State revenues were robust, despite projections for deficits in upcoming years. The UC budget included the governor's seven percent increase for the UC and restoration of three percent in compact funding that had been deferred for the 2025-26 budget. While the UC budget is on balance a positive one for the next year, restoration of funds for deferred non-resident replacement funds at UC Berkeley, UCLA, and UC San Diego is unlikely even though the budget planned for its repayment in the 2027-28 budget year. Despite the generally positive budget news, the compact had promised five percent growth in funding annually, with four of those intended to cover operations and one to cover enrollment growth. However, operating costs exceeded four percent, and undergraduate enrollment exceeded one percent, leaving the UC with a structural shortfall.

CFO Brostrom noted that the Regents agreed to use one percent of the Tuition Stability Plan to provide funds that campuses can use for deferred maintenance, capital renewal, or other needs less likely to be funded by the legislature.

Health insurance costs continue to rise. The Budget Management Workgroup plans to help campuses leverage revenue to pay for increasing health-related costs. UC Health remains greatly concerned about federal cuts to Medicaid, negatively impacting Medi-Cal reimbursements to health centers. Proposed changes to the Office of Management and Budget's (OMB) Uniform Guidance, changing how grant funds can be used, and potentially creating political tests for grant funding, will also negatively affect the UC's research and publishing efforts.

The UC faces budget challenges stemming from an increasingly represented labor force across the system. Graduate student costs will increase quite steeply for some students and some campuses. Affording enough graduate students to support increasing numbers of undergraduates in a time of great resource constraint will continue to challenge budget processes.

UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON ADAPTATION TO DISRUPTIONS PLUS (UCAD PLUS)

In December, UCPB met with co-chairs for two of the UCAD Plus workgroups, Workgroup Four, Instructional Opportunities, and Workgroup Five, Future of Graduate Education. Both UCAD Plus and UCPB were concerned about logistics of course sharing among campuses, documenting the impact of various funding disruptions on UC functioning, decision-making should programs need to be downsized or eliminated for budget concerns, teaching modality changes and impacts on graduate students, the impact of artificial intelligence on grading, and increased graduate labor costs. UCPB agreed to support the committee's work through sharing information regarding costs as they investigate graduate student funding and other issues.

CONSULTATION WITH THE OFFICE OF RESEARCH AND INNOVATION

In February, UCPB met with representatives from the office to discuss shared research facilities at the UC. The Provost initiated a catalog of “significant research facilities” across the UC system to find ways campuses can partner together to benefit all. CITRIS, one of the Cal institutes for science and innovation, can serve as a model of shared university and state investment in UC research infrastructure. While there are clear processes for building on a campus, there appears to be no coordinated planning for systemwide research infrastructure. Expense and rapid obsolescence complicate such planning. For example, computing research and gene sequencing have high rates of equipment turnover. UCPB sent a letter to Council supporting the effort to catalog research facilities across the UC and efforts to expand shared research capacity and AI resources.

SENATE LEADERSHIP BRIEFINGS

The Academic Council Chair and Vice Chair attended a portion of each UCPB meeting to brief the committee on business from Academic Council and Board of Regents meetings, and other systemwide issues of interest to UCPB or of general interest to faculty. The year’s topics included:

- Ongoing actions by the federal government and UC responses to them, both grant suspensions and actions taken directly against individual campuses.
- Faculty Discipline Reform: In response to Regents’ concerns about delays and inconsistency in faculty discipline, a Joint Senate-Administration Workgroup report suggested developing a systemwide framework with standardized sanction guidelines. The final recommendations included a central Privilege & Tenure committee network for urgent or sensitive cases. Regents accepted the plan for interim implementation, followed by a 90-day review in the fall.
- The University Committee on Adaptation to Disruptions (UCAD): This Senate committee focused on permanent versus temporary financial changes imposed by the federal government, and structural reforms to UC academic and administrative programs. Key areas of focus included 1) restructuring academic programs, 2) resizing programs and the workforce, 3) recalibrating growth objectives, and 4) realigning funding sources with mission activities. They released a report and were followed by a successor committee: UCAD Plus, which included administration personnel along with Senate representatives. After completing a final report, UCAD folded its work into UCAD Plus, and their final report will be sent out for systemwide review in fall, 2026.
- Labor issues, including bargaining progress with various represented groups including graduate students.
- Increasing health benefits costs.
- Proposed changes to the Presidential Post-Doctoral Fellowship Program (PPFP), including changes to hiring waivers and funding.
- Concerns over student preparation for the UC, especially in mathematics. These concerns led to discussion about reinstating the use of the SAT for applicants to the UC.

SELF-SUPPORTING GRADUATE PROFESSIONAL DEGREE PROGRAMS (SSGPDPs)

UCPB reviewed 12 SSGPDPs, this academic year:

- UC Davis Master of Engineering in Water Resources Engineering
- UC Davis Master of Engineering in Sustainable Transportation
- UC Davis Master of Engineering in Biomedical Engineering for Healthcare Technologies
- UC Riverside Online Master of Business Administration Degree (OMBA)
- UC San Francisco Master of Science in Global Regulator Science and Innovation

- UC Berkeley Master of Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning
- UC Santa Barbara Master of Engineering and Technology Leadership
- UC San Diego Master of Design
- UC Davis Online Master in Preventative Veterinary Medicine
- UCLA Master of Population Data Science
- UC Berkeley Master of Instructional Design (MInD)
- UC Santa Cruz Master in Science Artificial Intelligence and Data Science

UCPB members served as lead reviewers for the SSGPDPs. Reviews addressed the financial viability of the SSGPDP; the proposed indirect cost (IDC) rate and its determination; the planned use of net revenues; and the disposition and compensation of faculty serving the program. Reviewers also considered factors that could prevent the program from achieving UC quality; the extent to which SSGPDPs could divert resources – including space, services, and faculty effort – away from state-supported programs; their financial aid plan, and other factors that could affect accessibility to diverse and underserved student populations. Concerns were raised about the academic quality of some of the proposed degrees and the effect of proposed programs on those existing on campus. Reviewers noted positive elements in specific proposals such as strong academic and market justifications, or well-documented academic, business, and facilities usage plans. UCPB wrote a letter to Council Supporting the effort to catalog research facilities across the UC and support efforts to expand shared research capacity and AI resources.

UCPB COMMENTS ON PROPOSED POLICIES, PROGRAM NAME CHANGES, AND DRAFT REPORTS TO THE ACADEMIC COUNCIL:

- Name Change, UC Davis School of Veterinary Medicine to the University of California, Davis, Joan and Sanford I. Weill School of Veterinary Medicine
- Feedback on the Systemwide Budget Management Workgroup Final Report
- Support for a Systemwide Core Facilities Inventory
- Proposed Presidential Policy IMT-1300 Information Technology Accessibility
- Feedback on the University Committee on Adaptation to Disruptions (UCAD) Interim Report
- Feedback on the Degree Plus Program
- Proposal on Undergraduate Application Fees
- Proposed Presidential Policy on Education Loan Practices
- Proposed Presidential Policy on Sustainable Practices
- Proposed Revisions to the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) Section 036, General University Policy regarding Academic appointees/Employment
- Proposal to Establish Systemwide Academic Senate Committee on Climate Change and Sustainability
- Proposed Name Change of the School of Computing, Information, and Data Sciences at UC San Diego
- Proposed Presidential Policy BFB-BUS-43

CAMPUS UPDATES

UCPB set aside a portion of each meeting for updates about issues under discussion on campuses and local budget and planning committees. All campuses reported on ongoing effects of federal changes to grants, lawsuit threats to various campuses, and structural budget deficits. Other issues facing campuses were shortfalls in athletic funding, changes in leadership at the highest levels of administration, new budget models, shared governance, increasingly costly graduate student employment landscapes, increased undergraduate enrollment, AI impacts within and without the classroom, new requirements for website accessibility, Presidential Post-Doctoral Fellowship Program (PPFP) hiring waivers, shared governance, oversight of self-supported graduate degree programs, and revenue generation ideas.

UCPB REPRESENTATION

Chair Robert Brosnan represented UCPB at meetings of the Academic Council, the Assembly of the Academic Senate, the Academic Planning Committee (APC), the University Committee on Adaptation to Disruptions Plus and shared representation on the Health Care Task Force (HCTF) with Vice Chair Brewer. Vice Chair Alyssa Brewer served as UCPB representative to the Health Care Task Force (HCTF), Professor Rena Zieve served as representative to the Academic Council Special Committee on Lab Issues (ASCOLI), Professor Maria Pantelia served as UCPB representative to the Education Abroad Program (UCEAP), and Professor Jenny Liu served as UCPB liaison to TFIR.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

UCPB benefited from regular consultations with CFO Nathan Brostrom, Associate Vice President for Budget Analysis and Planning Caín Diaz, and Associate Director of State Government Relations Seija Virtanen. UCPB is also grateful to the following consultants and guests for their contributions: UCSD alternate Sharona Ben-Haim, UCSF alternate Torsten Wittman, UCSF alternate Tracy Lin, UCSB alternate Julie Bianchini, UCSB Alternate Andrew Teel, UCSC alternate Jeremy Hourigan, Immediate Past UCLA Division Chair Kathy Bawn, Vice Provost for Teaching and Learning and Dean, Division of Undergraduate Education at UCI Michael Dennin, Vice Provost for Academic Personnel, UCI Gillian Hayes, Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost, UCSB David Marshall, UCM Division Chair Kevin Mitchell, UCORP Chair James Weatherall, Interim Campus Provost and EVC, UCSC Paul Koch, Interim Executive Advisor, Systemwide Research Strategy Randy Katz, Director of Systemwide Research Strategy Lifang Chiang, Research Strategy Officer Thomas Dugger, Research Strategy Officer IK Udekwu, UCFW's ` Task Force on Investment and Retirement Committee members David Brownstone and James Chalfant, Deputy Provost Amy K. Lee, Associate Vice President of Employee and Labor Relations Melissa Matella, Senior Executive Director Maynard Jenkins, Executive Director Holli Griffin Strauss, Associate Vice Provost and Executive Director, Undergraduate Admissions Han-Mi Yoon-Wu, Students Kayla Chea (Undergraduate Representative) and Sarah Bacon (Graduate student Representative).

Respectfully submitted:

Robert Brosnan, Chair, UC Davis
Alyssa Brewer, Vice Chair, UC Irvine
Pheng Cheah, UC Berkeley
Rena Zieve, UC Davis
Maria Pantelia, UC Irvine
Richar Desjardins, UC Los Angeles
Michael Beman UC Merced

David Ogelsby, UC Riverside
Oliver Schmidt, UC San Diego
Jenny Liu, UC San Francisco
Barry Giesbrecht, UC Santa Cruz
Barbara Rafael Kudela, UC Santa Cruz
Stefani Leto, Analyst



UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PREPARATORY EDUCATION
ANNUAL REPORT 2025-2026

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

During the 2025-2026 Academic Year, the University Committee on Preparatory Education (UCOPE) held four videoconferences and met in person once, and UCOPE's English for Multilingual Students Advisory Group (EMS AG) and the Entry Level Writing Requirement Coordinating Council (ECC) each met once in person and each met via videoconference once. All groups considered matters in accordance with their duties as set forth in Senate Bylaw 192, Senate Regulation 636, and SR 761 (and relevant subcommittee charges), which state that UCOPE shall advise the President on matters relating to preparatory and remedial education (including the language needs of students from diverse linguistic backgrounds); monitor and conduct periodic reviews and evaluations of preparatory and remedial education; supervise the University of California Entry Level Writing Requirement (ELWR); monitor the development and use of placement examinations in English, mathematics, and other subjects; and work with the Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools to communicate these standards to all high schools and colleges in California. A summary of the committee's activities and accomplishments follows below:

SENATE BYLAW 192

Given the rescission of the Analytical Writing Placement Examination (AWPE), the UCOPE bylaw must be amended to conform. Additional changes to SBL 192 and Senate Regulations 636 and 761 were proposed by the committee to clarify the scope and purview of its subcommittees as well as to modernize long-standing language to meet contemporary academic standards and expectations. After undergoing systemwide review, the proposed changes were sent back to UCOPE for further refinement, which next year's UCOPE will undertake.

ENGLISH FOR MULTILINGUAL STUDENTS ADVISORY GROUP

The English for Multilingual Students Advisory Group (EMS AG) works to ensure that students from diverse linguistic backgrounds follow appropriate course sequences in academic English to ensure their ultimate success at UC. In addition to the standard campus reports, EMS AG discussed issues related to budget and staffing, including the ongoing impacts of the graduate student researchers'/instructors' change in employment status, and changes to its charge. A comparative assessment of course sequence offerings and student success outcomes was generated.

ENTRY LEVEL WRITING REQUIREMENT

- The ELWR Coordinating Council (ECC) is UCOPE's subcommittee composed of Writing Studies experts who provide expert oversight of and support to the state-mandated ELWR, ELWR-satisfying courses, and ELWR placement practices. The ECC oversees regular

assessment of campus placement models and curricula and supports ELWR by advocating in favor of campuses receiving the resources that they need to ensure that ELWR placement mechanisms remain reliable and valid instruments of equity. 2025-26 was the second year of ECC operation, and the group worked to standardized summaries of each campus's practices and derive best practice. Three campuses submitted in-depth reports of their ELWR operations and outcomes, with three more campuses to follow each of the next two years. Additionally, the remaining campuses submitted shorter summary documents of courses available locally, local ELWR governance and administration practices, and student outcomes.

- UCOPE met with representatives from the Smarter Balanced Assessment Consortium (SBAC) to discuss the test, its administration, and how data from the test could inform UCOPE's duties. The Irvine campus is conducting a pilot study focusing on the correlation of SBAC scores, ELWR outcomes, and first-year student success; a report is expected next year.
- UCOPE and ECC met with representatives from the College Board to discuss changes to the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT), including digital administration, scoring, take-rates, and their impacts to student accessibility and subsequent success, and changes to Advanced Placement (AP) scoring practices and their impact to student success.
- UCOPE met with representatives from International Baccalaureate to learn more about the program and how its courses might be used to satisfy ELWR and indicate satisfaction of other preparatory expectations.

UCOPE REPRESENTATION

UCOPE Chair Queen represented the committee at meetings of the Intersegmental Committee of Academic Senates.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

UCOPE gratefully acknowledges the contributions of these UCOP and campus consultants over the past year: EMS Advisory Group Chair Karyn Kessler and all members of the EMS Advisory Group; ECC Chair Madeleine Sorapure and all members of the ECC; Han Mi Yoon-Wu, Associate Vice President, Undergraduate Admissions; Matt Reed, Institutional Research Analyst, Institutional Research and Academic Planning (IRAP); and Tongshan Chang, Director, IRAP. UCOPE also thanks Dave Volz, chair of the Board of Admission and Relations with Schools (BOARS) for collaborating with UCOPE on issues of shared importance.

Respectfully submitted,

Bradley Queen, Chair

John Tamkun, Vice Chair

Nasser Zakariya, UCB

Timothy Lewis, UCD

Emily Penner, UCI

Kie Zuraw, UCLA

Aurora Pribram-Jones, UCM

Agnieszka Jaworska, UCR

Pedro Cabrales Arevalo, UCSD
Brian Dolan, UCSF
Rebecca Rios, UCSB
Nicole Hammopnd, UCSC
Kenneth Feer, Principal Policy Analyst



**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGE AND TENURE
Annual Report 2025-26**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

Consistent with Bylaw 40 the committee shall: (Am 23 May 01; Am 28 May 2003)

1. Advise the President, the Academic Senate and its Divisions, and the Divisional Privilege and Tenure Committees on general policies involving academic privileges and tenure [see Bylaw 334]. (Am 25 May 76; EC 28 May 2003)
2. Coordinate the Systemwide Reserve Privilege and Tenure Pool of faculty available to augment campus hearing committees, or to constitute a Special Hearing Committee, as provided for in Bylaw 336.A. (Am 12 Feb 2026)
3. Maintain statistical records of the grievance, disciplinary, and early termination cases taking place on each of the campuses, as specified in Bylaw 334.B . (EC 28 May 2003)

Executive Summary

During 2025-26, UCPT focused extensively on faculty discipline policy, privilege and tenure procedures, academic freedom, civil rights compliance, and digital accessibility. Central to these efforts was the committee's role as a key advisory body on revisions to APM 015-016 and related governance processes, including the development of a systemwide reserve pool for Privilege and Tenure proceedings.

Major Accomplishments

UCPT helped inform revisions to faculty discipline policies, supported changes to Senate Bylaws 334, 335, and 337, participated in Senate-administration workgroups, and developed the foundation for the Systemwide Privilege and Tenure Reserve Pool. The committee devoted substantial effort to reviewing revisions to APM 015-016 and related procedures governing investigations, faculty misconduct, and disciplinary processes. These reforms were subsequently approved through shared governance processes. UCPT discussed and implemented procedures for creating the first systemwide reserve pool of faculty members available to serve in privilege and tenure matters when campuses require external participation.

Consultations and Shared Governance

UCPT met throughout the year with Academic Senate leadership, Academic Personnel, Faculty Affairs, UC Legal, and the Office of Civil Rights to discuss emerging issues affecting faculty governance and due process. The committee consulted regularly with the Office of Civil Rights regarding Title IX, anti-discrimination policy implementation, disability rights, accommodations, and digital accessibility requirements.

Acknowledgments

UCPT is grateful to have had valuable input from - and exchange with - these UCOP consultants and guests over the past year: Amy K. Lee, Deputy Provost, Academic Personnel; Monica Varsanyi, Vice Provost, Faculty Affairs and Academic Programs; Kelly Anders, Executive Director and Deputy, Academic Personnel; Carly Munson, Principal Counsel; Catherine Spear, Executive Director of the Office of Civil Rights, Nicoli Richardson, Title IX Director, Meena Chandra, Anti-Discrimination Director; and Wendy Tobias, Disability Rights Director. Special thanks to Academic Senate Chair Ahmet Palazoglu, Vice Chair Susannah Scott, and Senate Executive Director Monica Lin.



University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP) Annual Report 2025-26

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

The University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP), as specified in Senate Bylaw 200, is responsible for fostering research; formulating, coordinating, and revising general research policies and procedures; and advising the President on research. UCORP met once in person and seven times via videoconference during the 2025-26 academic year. This report summarizes the committee's activities over the course of the year.

With no multicampus research units scheduled for review this year, UCORP's discussions focused on the federal research funding crisis and resulting uncertainty, graduate education and the impacts of unionization on graduate student employment, and the deliberations of the joint Senate-Administration Task Force on UC Adaptation to Disruptions (UCAD Plus). The committee also discussed the changing landscape of animal research and the need for stronger research funding transparency at the University.

The status of a proposed federal rate cap for indirect costs (IDC) was uncertain for much of the year, and UCORP members spent time at several meetings discussing potential outcomes and scenarios for the university. A group of academic and research organizations developed a proposal for accounting for indirect costs called the "FAIR model" ("Fiscal Accountability in Research") that Congress might adopt as legislation to supersede any executive branch policies.

RESEARCH FUNDING TRANSPARENCY

In December, UCORP heard a presentation from Craig Callender, UCSD Professor of Philosophy and Co-Director of the Institute for Practical Ethics at UC San Diego, about research disinformation and how universities might address the problem. He made the case that academic institutions could be inadvertently contributing to disinformation by accepting funding from industry sources, drawing examples from big tobacco and fossil fuel companies that fund educational centers and exert influence on research results. After further discussion by UCORP members, Chair Weatherall proposed that the Senate convene a workgroup to investigate what UC can do to counter and prevent unethical outcomes. In May, Academic Council Chair Ahmet Palazoglu issued a special charge for a UCORP Workgroup on Research Funding Transparency for 2026-27. The workgroup will develop recommendations in collaboration with UCAF and UCFW.

ANIMAL RESEARCH

UCORP members discussed the new emphasis in animal research on scientific necessity. Researchers should expect to provide rationales for why animals are needed rather than an alternative, and to explain how the research advances human health outcomes. UCOP research administrators noted that UC has an opportunity to continue to support animal research that is scientifically necessary while at the same time investing in and developing networks and entities

focused on alternatives. An animal research transparency group that was convened a few years ago by the administration will likely be revived, with more conversations going forward.

OTHER TOPICS

Updates from the Office of Research & Innovation – As consultants to the committee, directors from the Office of Research & Innovation (R&I) joined UCORP each month to provide updates and solicit feedback on research-related topics at UC, including issues around federal funding, systemwide research initiatives, and new and updated policies.

Lab Fees Research Program – UCORP provided input into plans for an overhaul of the Lab Fees Research Program, which uses the revenue earned by UC for managing the national labs to sponsor research and foster new collaborations between UC faculty and national laboratory scientists. The idea is to make it more nimble and responsive to current priorities. Oversight of the program will move from the Office of Research & Innovation to the Office of UC National Labs.

Regulation for Federal Financial Assistance Proposed Rule – The proposed changes to Uniform Guidance (UG) released from the Office of Management and Budget at the end of May were much broader than anticipated. UCORP’s consultants from the Office of Research & Innovation joined the UCORP meeting to talk about the potential impacts on UC if the changes are implemented and how the University planned to respond. UCORP members provided initial input and then offered written feedback to UC’s draft response letter. UC Federal Government Relations (FGR) Research Director Phillip Harman also joined UCORP’s June meeting to talk about the proposed rule’s potentially serious and adverse implications not only for UC researchers, but for the national research enterprise.

UC patent tracking system – Interim Executive Director for Innovation Transfer and Entrepreneurship Kimberly Jones-Ross joined UCORP’s May meeting to provide an update on UC’s new patent tracking system. UC holds 6,000 active US patents and over 12,000 patents worldwide. The new system, which uses Wellspring’s Evolve technology and a Salesforce platform, will bring more efficiency and transparency for its more than 3,000 users.

SYSTEMWIDE SENATE ISSUES, CAMPUS REPORTS, LIAISON REPORTS

UCORP devoted part of each regular meeting to updates from Academic Senate leadership and reports from members on campus COR issues, including faculty grant programs. Liaisons to various other workgroups and committees provided regular updates as well.

Specific topics discussed during the round-robin sessions included:

- Campus efforts to provide bridge funding for faculty whose grants were adversely impacted by federal funding cuts.
- Structural deficits and challenges to campus support for research, including COR administered research funds.
- Impacts on research from the graduate student researcher (GSR) collective bargaining agreement.
- Impacts of AI on research and discussions following the release of the Senate AI Workgroup report.
- Continuing impacts from Oracle financial system transitions at UC Davis and UC San Diego. UC Davis formed a faculty-administration joint committee and UCSD faculty continue to advocate for financial accountability when faculty are adversely affected by errors in reporting or posting.

SYSTEMWIDE REVIEW PARTICIPATION AND CORRESPONDENCE

- Interim Report and Recommendations of the Academic Senate Task Force on UC Adaptation to Disruptions (UCAD) (10/31/2025)
- Interim Systemwide Guidelines on Faculty Discipline and Revisions to APM 015 and 016 (11/10/2025)
- Proposed Presidential Policy on Responding to Allegations of Research Misconduct (12/10/2025)
- Proposed Presidential Policy on Sustainable Practices (12/10/2025)
- Proposed Revisions to UC Policy on Anatomical Donation Program and Anatomical Materials (3/18/2026)
- Proposal to Establish a Systemwide Academic Senate Committee on Climate Change and Sustainability (4/21/2026)
- UCORP also provided input to UC's Comments on the Proposed Rule, Regulation for Federal Financial Assistance, released on May 29, 2026 (7/1/2026)

UCORP REPRESENTATION

- As Chair of UCORP, James Weatherall served on the Assembly of the Academic Senate, Academic Council, and the Academic Planning Council.
- Chair Weatherall co-chaired one of the workgroups of the Senate-Administration Task Force on UC Adaptation to Disruptions (UCAD Plus).
- Chair Weatherall and Vice Chair Elina Zuniga served on the Faculty Advisory Committee on Graduate Education and Employment.
- Ramesh Rao (UC San Diego) served on Academic Council Special Committee on Laboratory Issues (ACSCOLI).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

UCORP is grateful to its regular consultants who have provided invaluable information and perspective to the committee:

- Agnes Balla, Director, Research Policy Analysis and Coordination
- Lourdes DeMattos, Director, Research Policy Analysis and Coordination
- Kathleen Erwin, Executive Director, Research Grants Program Office
- Coreen Harada, Executive Director for Research & Innovation and Special Assistant to the Vice President for Research & Innovation
- Theresa Maldonado, Vice President for Research & Innovation
- Deborah Motton, Executive Director, Research Policy Analysis and Coordination
- Anna Ward, Program Officer, Research Grants Program Office

UCORP also wishes to thank its invited guests for their participation and support throughout the year, as well as colleagues across the system who brought to the attention of the committee research-related issues of concern.

Respectfully submitted, UCORP 2025-26:

James Weatherall, Chair (UC Irvine)
 Elina Zuniga, Vice Chair (UC San Diego)
 Ana Arias (UC Berkeley)
 Eliza Bliss-Moreau (UC Davis)

Michael Fortun (UC Irvine)
Dimitri Shlyahtenko, (UCLA)
Ramendra "Ramen" Saha (UC Merced)
Padma Rangarajan (UC Riverside)
Ramesh Rao (UC San Diego)
Kartika Palar (UC San Francisco)
Dave Valentine (UC Santa Barbara)
Nirvikar Singh (UC Santa Cruz)
Manar Ahmed (Undergraduate Student, UC Merced)
Ahmet Palazoglu, Academic Council Chair, *Ex Officio*
Susannah Scott, Academic Council Vice Chair, *Ex Officio*
Joanne Miller, Committee Analyst



**UNIVERSITY COMMITTEE ON RULES AND JURISDICTION (UCRJ)
ANNUAL REPORT 2025-26**

TO THE ASSEMBLY OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE:

Pursuant to Senate Bylaws [205](#) and [206](#), the University Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction (UCRJ) is charged with:

- Examining and supervising all changes and additions to Senate bylaws and regulations, both substantive and editorial;
- Examining divisional legislation that may affect systemwide bylaws and regulations;
- Preparing and reporting to the Assembly or divisions such changes and additions to the bylaws and regulations as may seem to it advisable;
- Making non-substantive editorial and conforming revisions in the bylaws and regulations, including adjustments to numbering, headings, cross-references, organizational titles, stylistic elements, and similar items;
- Issuing Legislative Rulings interpreting the Code of the Senate upon request from Senate leaders, following consultation with the Academic Council;
- Deciding challenges to actions of University committees alleged to conflict with Senate rules, and hearing appeals from divisional rulings on such matters;
- Responding to informal requests from Senate members for interpretations or guidance regarding the Code, with all such correspondence filed with the Secretary/Parliamentarian and summarized in this annual report;
- Supervising inclusion of Assembly-approved variances to Senate Regulations and ensuring divisional manuals conform with Senate Bylaws.

During the 2025-26 academic year, UCRJ met two times by videoconference and conducted other business via email. Major actions are summarized below.

LEGISLATIVE RULINGS

Interpretation of Senate Bylaws 110 and 120: The Senate chair asked UCRJ to consider questions concerning agenda-setting authority for special and emergency Assembly meetings. UCRJ issued a ruling interpreting Senate Bylaws 110 and 120, noting that petitioners may require specified business to be included but may not restrict the agenda exclusively to those items; the Senate chair, in consultation with the Academic Council, may add other properly noticed matters within the Assembly's authority. The ruling was added as Ruling 1.26 to Appendix II of the Manual of the Academic Senate.

Departmental Voting Rights Under Senate Bylaw 55 (UCI): At the UCI Division's request, UCRJ issued a ruling concerning the voting rights of Senate members holding appointments of varying percentages, including joint appointments without salary. UCRJ ruled that neither appointment percentage nor salary status determines departmental voting rights; once a joint appointment is established, the Senate member has voting rights in both the home and host departments, subject to the personnel voting provisions of Bylaws 55.B and 55.C.

ADVICE AND REVIEWS REQUESTED BY THE SENATE CHAIR

- **Senate Chair and Academic Council Authority Regarding Senate Committee Work:** UCRJ interpreted Senate Bylaws 110, 125, and 145 concerning the respective authority of the Senate chair, Academic Council, and BOARS. UCRJ concluded that the chair may request committee consideration of matters within its jurisdiction, while Council may request reports and identify desired deliverables and timelines; however, committees retain discretion over their internal processes, may reconsider prior actions, and cannot be compelled to follow a prescribed process or meet an enforceable deadline.
- **Conversion of Regents Standing Orders to Bylaws:** UCRJ reviewed the proposed conversion of Regents Standing Orders into Regents Bylaws and concurred that it was primarily a technical and organizational change, with no identified inconsistencies with the Senate Code.

ADVICE TO DIVISIONS AND COMMITTEES

Joint Degree Program (CCGA): At CCGA's request, UCRJ reviewed the proposed Joint M.A. Degree Program in Contemporary Philosophy between UCSB and the University of Athens and concluded that its design was inconsistent with Senate Regulation 694.2, which limits off-campus study for an M.A. degree to no more than one-half of the total unit and residence requirements. UCRJ also recommended a broader review of the graduate regulations governing residence, off-campus study, and international joint degree programs to establish clearer standards for such programs.

UCR Query: The UCRJ chair provided informal guidance, rather than a formal committee interpretation, to the Riverside Division Committee on Rules and Jurisdiction concerning a unit bylaw that inadvertently excluded several departments from eligibility for service on an executive committee.

EVALUATION OF PROPOSED CHANGES TO SENATE BYLAWS AND REGULATIONS

UCRJ evaluated the following proposed bylaw and regulation changes for consistency with the Code of the Academic Senate:

- **Revisions to Senate Bylaws 195 and 336 (UCPT):** UCRJ advised on terminology, procedural clarity, implementation timelines, and the relationship of the proposed revisions to divisional authority over privilege and tenure processes.
- **Revision to Senate Regulation 904 (CCGA):** UCRJ concurred with CCGA's proposal to add "academic notice" to clarify the terminology governing graduate student academic standing and align it with recent revisions affecting undergraduates.
- **Revisions to Senate Bylaw 192 and Senate Regulations 636 and 761 (UCOPE):** UCRJ found the proposed revisions consistent with the Senate Code, noting that they aligned UCOPE's charge and the Entry Level Writing Requirement provisions with current placement practices.
- **Revision to Senate Bylaw 337:** UCRJ found the proposed revision consistent with the Senate Code.
- **Revisions to Senate Bylaws 334 and 335 (UCPT):** UCRJ reviewed proposed revisions clarifying access to grievance procedures for eligible non-Senate academic appointees and advised on terminology, consistency, and technical drafting.
- **Revisions to Senate Bylaw 140 (UCAADE):** UCRJ endorsed the proposed committee name change and found the revised charge consistent with the Senate Code, while recommending two

clarifications to improve precision and define the committee's scope.

- **Proposed Systemwide Committee on Climate Change and Sustainability:** UCRJ advised that Senate Bylaw 325 would require each division to designate a corresponding committee, noted that Senate Bylaw 128 would also require amendment, and recommended clarifying the proposed committee charge.

VARIANCES

UCRJ evaluated and endorsed the following variances to Senate regulations:

- UCLA variances to Senate Regulations 740, 780, 784, 810, and 900
- UCLA variances to Senate Regulation 900

Respectfully submitted,

Kathleen Montgomery (UCR), Chair
Jennifer Wagman (UCLA), Divisional Committee Chair
Irfan Kathiriya (UCSF), Divisional Committee Chair
Hans-Georg Müller (UCD), Member-at-Large
Liz Glynn (UCI), Member-at-Large

UCRJ Staff: Michael LaBriola, Assistant Director