The Regents of the University of California met on the above date at the UCLA Luskin Conference Center, Los Angeles campus.

Members present: Regents Anguiano, Batchlor, Chu, Cohen, Drake, Elliott, Ellis, Hernandez, Lee, Leib, Makarechian, Matosantos, Pérez, Raznick, Reilly, Robinson, Sarris, Sherman, Sures, and Tesfai

In attendance: Regents-designate Beharry, Pack, and Salazar, Faculty Representatives Cheung and Steintrager, Staff Advisors Emiru and Mackness, Secretary and Chief of Staff Lyall, General Counsel Robinson, Provost Newman, Chief Compliance and Audit Officer Bustamante, Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer Brostrom, Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer Nava, Executive Vice President Rubin, Interim Senior Vice President Reese, Vice President Brown, Chancellors Block, Christ, Gillman, Hawgood, Khosla, Larive, Muñoz, Wilcox, and Yang, and Recording Secretary Li

The meeting convened at 8:45 a.m. with Chair Leib presiding.

1. **PUBLIC COMMENT**

Chair Leib stated that the University of California valued freedom of speech and viewed individual rights to free expression as key to the open discourse that is vital within higher education. The University sought to make room for all perspectives, and the upcoming public comment period would operate with these freedoms in mind, during which speakers would be given the opportunity to share their viewpoints. Given that some comments might elicit disagreement, the Board asked that all in attendance conduct themselves and allow everyone an equal opportunity to express their opinions. The Board would not permit a response of protest that is disruptive, silences other speakers, or prevents the orderly conduct of the meeting. Disruption of this magnitude might require that the public comment period conclude and disrupting individuals be escorted from the venue and possibly subject to arrest. It was the goal of the Board to have a peaceful and respectful public comment period.

Chair Leib explained that the public comment period permitted members of the public an opportunity to address University-related matters. The following persons addressed the Board concerning the items noted.

A. Nan Zhong addressed the transparency of University admissions. Mr. Zhong claimed that UC was systematically directing hatred at and penalizing Asian applicants, and he compared UC to far-right political extremists. He stated that the University’s admissions office had been stonewalling him for the past four months, and that more Asian students would suffer if nothing is done. He added that far-left
policies would destroy people’s trust in public institutions and feed into the narrative of the far right. Mr. Zhong called on UC to stay in the center and to speak with common sense.

B. Hoku Jeffrey, organizer from the Coalition to Defend Affirmative Action, Integration and Immigrant Rights, and Fight for Equality By Any Means Necessary (BAMN), called for an end to bombing, starvation, and the genocidal invasion and occupation of Gaza. He stated that the Board must vote “no” on item J1, Adoption of Regents Policy on Public and Discretionary Statements by Academic Units. There have been marches against genocide in Gaza in 250 cities across the U.S. and in London, England. Mr. Jeffrey stated that the proposal in J1 would ban political speech and targeted pro-Palestinian activists.

C. Makayla Drew, UC Riverside student and Student Advisor to the Regents (StAR), shared that the lack of communication infrastructure in the UC–Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) Initiative Fellowship has had a devastating effect on HBCU students who were enrolling at UC for graduate education, because the demographics of UC’s graduate communities differed from those of these students’ undergraduate communities. Ms. Drew suggested that UC establish a cross-campus line of communication for UC-HBCU fellows and a point of contact for fellows entering the University for graduate education.

D. Jelani Nelson, UC Berkeley professor, questioned the content of high school data science textbooks in connection with UC admissions requirements and asked Regent Hernandez to examine sample material from youcubed, a program for mathematics teachers from the Stanford University Graduate School of Education. According to the Workgroup on Mathematics (Area C) Preparation convened by the Academic Senate’s Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS), the high school data science course was the least mathematical among the courses it reviewed. Mr. Nelson shared that two teachers regarded the course as fun and engaging but at an eighth grade level. He urged the Board to take no action today and to allow the Area C Workgroup to complete its report.

E. Clara Castronovo, UCLA student and board chair of California Public Interest Research Group (CALPIRG) Students, addressed textbook affordability. The White House recently announced its opposition to automatic textbook billing, which added extra charges for materials. Ms. Castronovo shared that she did not realize that she had to opt out of automatic textbook billing and was charged $85 for optional books. Surprise fees presented a challenge for students already struggling with expenses, and automatic textbook billing was often not the most financially accessible option for obtaining materials. The University should move away from automatic textbook billing and move toward open education resources.

F. Kira Stein, speaking on behalf of the UCLA Jewish Faculty Resilience Group, stated that, on October 7, over 5,000 rockets were launched from Gaza into Israel and over 1,000 Israelis and foreigners were massacred. Dr. Stein stated that
civilians were tortured and raped, and the whereabouts and condition of the majority of 253 hostages was unknown. The Jewish Faculty Resilience Group acknowledged the loss of Gazan civilians caught in the crossfire, mourned every innocent life lost, and called for all parties to move towards peace and compassion. She exhorted the Regents to ensure that, in the face of conflict, UC campuses model academic integrity, promote freedom of thought, and be inclusive of people identifying with all religions, ethnicities, races, and national origins.

G. Richard Finn, UCLA School of Medicine professor, stated that Jewish faculty at UCLA were under attack by peers and pupils due to their Jewish identity, their support for Israel’s right to exist, or their Israeli nationality. Dr. Finn stated that Jewish faculty were being barraged with libelous, baseless, and negative evaluations and unwarranted grievances. This has not been condemned; rather, some in positions of power encouraged Jewish educators to defend themselves against accusations of discrimination, endorsed accusers’ claims, and coerced Jewish educators to renounce intentions they never held. The UCLA Jewish Faculty Resilience Group urged the Regents to classify this as an incident of concern under item B2(X), Incidents of Concern.

H. Oleg Gleizer, UCLA professor, shared that, during the fall term, his lectures for Math 61: Introduction to Discrete Structures were interrupted twice by pro-Palestinian demonstrators who tried to enter his classroom. During each incident, Mr. Gleizer took time to secure the classroom and calm down his students. As a first-generation immigrant from the Soviet Union, he was a strong proponent of the First Amendment but characterized the interruption of lectures as an act of hooliganism. Mr. Gleizer asked that the UC Police Department and UCLA investigate and ensure that this does not happen in the future, adding that this was disturbing the peace under California Penal Code Section 415.

I. Gloria Tavera, UCSF resident physician and member of the Committee of Interns and Residents of the Service Employees International Union (CIR/SEIU), called on UCSF to cease the punitive treatment of resident physicians who voluntarily disclose pre-existing conditions. UCSF required resident physicians to sign a non-negotiable return to work agreement, which was recently used to justify a termination. CIR/SEIU asked that UCSF allow resident physicians to negotiate the terms of treatment and have counsel. Four hundred resident physicians signed a letter and have been waiting since July 2023 for a substantive reply.

J. Charles Bay, UCSF resident physician and member of CIR/SEIU, called on UCSF to cease the punitive treatment of resident physicians who voluntarily disclose pre-existing conditions and reiterated Dr. Tavera’s comments. Dr. Bay noted that seeking care for a mental condition was extremely difficult in his profession, which saw high levels of burnout and some of the highest suicide rates.

K. Scott La Rochelle, UCLA law student, requested the reinstatement of the Public Service Law Fellowship, which provided $5 million in annual funding for public
interest law internships and postgraduate fellowships. His peers were able to work at the public defender’s office, in housing rights, at immigration law clinics, and more. During his internship at the U.S. Department of the Treasury, Mr. La Rochelle worked on decarbonization and climate change, areas he wished to pursue in his career. The Fellowship addressed a critical funding gap in the legal field and enabled more law students to pursue public service legal jobs. Mr. La Rochelle stated that public service lawyers provided legal representation to one in five Californians living below the poverty line, defended public, civil, and constitutional rights, and worked to protect democracy.

L. Emily Chinn, UCLA student, shared that the Campus Assault Resource and Education (CARE) program, which provided free and confidential support to survivors of sexual violence, was extremely underfunded and understaffed, and 50 percent of staff had a turnover rate of 2.5 years. The CARE program at UCLA shared office space with campus case managers, which compromised survivor confidentiality and could expose survivors to their perpetrators. Ms. Chinn urged the Regents to prioritize direct and permanent funding for all CARE programs and anticipated the steps that UC would take in April.

M. Zoe Moskowitz, UCLA student, thanked the Regents for their efforts to combat antisemitism and shared that Jewish students at UCLA were in an environment that encouraged the interests of those who are antisemitic, support the Boycott, Divestment and Sanctions (BDS) movement, and do not believe in the right of Israel to exist. The increase in antisemitic incidents on campus in the last six months, including a swastika etched on library walls, signage that read “Jews are Nazis,” and anti-Zionist rhetoric posted on campus and on social media, must be addressed. Ms. Moskowitz feared for the safety of Jewish students, their allies, and those who support the State of Israel. She urged the Regents to proactively combat and prevent antisemitism, approve item J1, and honor the Principles of Community.

N. Jasmine Beroukhim, UCLA alumna and program manager at the Jewish Federation of Los Angeles, expressed fear that persistent harassment, bullying, abuse, and targeting of Jewish students on campus was worsening. The Jewish community was exhausted by acts of antisemitism taking place across the country and on campus and felt that it was combating antisemitism alone. She implored the Regents to consider the gravity of this situation, which infects and poisons society as a whole.

O. Jaden Penhaskashi, UCLA student, decried the antisemitism he was experiencing on campus and shared that his family had fled to Israel from Iran after experiencing antisemitic threats, violence, and the killing of Jewish people. Mr. Penhaskashi saw signs on campus that characterized Jewish people as Nazis. He pled for the approval of item J1 to keep faculty aligned with their main priorities: education, supporting all students regardless of politics, and facilitating the sharing of student perspectives. Mr. Penhaskashi equated being anti-Zionist with being anti-Jewish.
P. Lillian Gelberg, UCLA School of Medicine professor and representative of the UCLA Jewish Faculty Resilience Group, stated that Jewish people have historically been subjected to unfounded accusations and stereotypes and were currently being subjected to similar libel at UCLA. A student’s social media post discussed the removal of an outdoor exhibit of a Shabbat, or Jewish Sabbath, table calling attention to Israeli hostages and warned that similar exhibits were laced with toxic chemicals. Dr. Gelberg added that Jewish people were being accosted on campus, falsely accused of supporting genocide, and discriminated against because of their Jewish identity or support of Israel. She stated that these amounted to antisemitism and hatred of Jewish people and should be considered incidents of concern under item B2(X). Dr. Gelberg stressed that the Regents must implement strategies to combat antisemitism on campus.

Q. Brian Conrad, mathematics professor and Director of Undergraduate studies at Stanford University, applauded recent UC policy action on mathematics preparation, which agreed with statements from the Academic Senate of the California State University, the Council of UC Faculty Associations, and hundreds of faculty experts from Stanford University and UC in economics, political science, data science, statistics and science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM). Mr. Conrad stated that branding mathematics-like courses as advanced mathematics was harmful to students, and that the creator of one such course admitted that it would lead students to miss basic mathematic literacy. At UCLA, entering the data science major required the completion of multivariable calculus and linear algebra. He remarked that fixing underrepresentation in quantitative fields required solid mathematics preparation, not the optics of redefining success. Mr. Conrad urged the Regents to allow the UC Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) Workgroup on Mathematics (Area C) Preparation to continue clarifying admissions criteria for fourth-year mathematics.

R. Tricia Gallagher-Geurtsen, lecturer at UC San Diego and UC Santa Cruz, stated that item J1 would not stop antisemitism and did not uphold academic freedom and free speech. She warned that censoring students on University-hosted websites would chill speech and create an environment that is hostile to multiple viewpoints. The policy would harm students, faculty, staff, and the wider community, and the wave of academic repression would damage the mission and public role of the University. This would imperil UC’s core commitment to academic freedom and its long-standing tradition of shared governance.

S. Taylor Rae Washington, UC Berkeley student, called attention to the challenges presented by unpaid internships for students in the UCB Master of Social Welfare (MSW) program, which required the completion of hundreds of unpaid hours of field experience for graduation. These hours fell on weekdays, making it nearly impossible for students to apply for full-time work. MSW students could not afford basic needs but were expected to conduct assessments, maintain emotionally taxing caseloads, and create and run programs. Ms. Washington called for paid placements or more financial support for MSW students.
T. Teesha Sreeram, UC Riverside student, stated that the student governments of five UC campuses have passed resolutions to support divestment per the Boycott, Divestment, and Sanctions (BDS) movement. Ms. Sreeram shared that many students were attending student government meetings and protesting on campus. She stated that divestment, which UC has done in the past, meant that tuition dollars would no longer support an ongoing genocide and ethnic cleansing in Palestine. Ms. Sreeram asked the University to listen to the wishes of its student body.

U. Erinn Fiedler, UCLA student and president of Clean Consulting, an undergraduate consulting club, shared that UCLA has been a client of this consulting club for the past six years and working to reduce energy and food waste. Ms. Fiedler stated that the new UC goal of achieving net-zero greenhouse gas emissions by 2045 stood in stark contrast to student efforts. She urged the Regents to discuss and adopt a resolution to reduce campus carbon emissions by 60 percent by 2030 and by 95 percent by 2035.

V. Greta Carl-Halle, Council of UC Staff Assemblies (CUCSA) delegate from UC Santa Barbara, called attention to some 5,000 vacancies systemwide and increased work demands on staff, which has resulted in poor morale, burnout, and poor retention. Prioritizing some tasks over others due to heavy workloads compromised operations and could lead to risk, safety, compliance, or liability issues, and problems with retention were leading to a loss of institutional knowledge and talent. Studies have shown that a reasonable workload mitigated stress, burnout, and depression. CUCSA asked the Regents to be mindful of the high-volume workload of staff when considering and implementing new policies and procedures. The University must holistically assess work and determine how to operate with less.

W. Zoe Bolesta-Reynolds, CUCSA delegate from UC Davis, shared that her salary was 17 percent below the market rate. CUCSA has used public comment to highlight the record number of vacancies and the importance of prioritizing staff consultation to improve retention. Staff did not have enough time to complete their assigned work, and recent UC policy decisions and governmental mandates created barriers and stress for staff already at breaking point. Ms. Bolesta-Reynolds stated that the University needed to reevaluate excessive administrative and logistical demands and allow staff to focus on one job at a time.

X. Kagba Suaray, professor in mathematics and statistics at California State University (CSU), Long Beach, shared that his dissertation on statistics and data science, which he wrote 20 years ago while attending UC San Diego, was highly theoretical and included no data sets. He shared that many Black youth did not have the luxury of learning mathematical theory and that one out of every four California Black students did not graduate from high school due to systemic circumstances. In Mr. Suaray’s view, the debate about data science focused on what is involved instead of who is involved, but data science courses could help Black students have a sense of belonging.
Y. Claire Machado, UC Berkeley law student, requested that UC reinstate the Public Service Law Fellowship, noting that she wished to pursue a career as a public defender and to improve the criminal justice system. Written comment signed by 1,200 law students, staff, and alumni underscored the importance of public service lawyers, who combat discrimination, expand access to education and other social benefits, protect the rights of low-wage workers, and more. Public service opportunities were often unpaid or severely underpaid, and the Fellowship bridged that funding gap for seven years.

Z. Frank Granda, UC Irvine student and member of the Associated Students of UCI, called for investment to establish a collegiate recovery program, hire at least one full-time staff member, designate physical space for recovery-related meetings, and ensure baseline standards at every UC campus. He stated that he was appalled that collegiate recovery programs were not available to all students, including at UCI.

AA. Ariela Rutbeck-Goldman, UC Irvine alumna, requested that UC reinstate the Public Service Law Fellowship. She recalled the impact of receiving a Leverage Fellowship from UCI, which provided funds that an employer would match. The Fellowship enabled her to move back to the East Coast and work at Legal Services of Northwest Jersey, where she still worked to this day.

The Board recessed at 9:30 a.m.

The Board reconvened at 1:15 p.m. with Chair Leib presiding.

Members present: Regents Anguiano, Batchlor, Chu, Cohen, Drake, Elliott, Ellis, Lee, Leib, Makarechian, Matosantos, Park, Pérez, Reilly, Robinson, Sarris, Sherman, and Sures

In attendance: Regents-designate Pack and Salazar, Faculty Representatives Cheung and Steintrager, Staff Advisors Emiru and Mackness, Secretary and Chief of Staff Lyall, General Counsel Robinson, Provost Newman, Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer Brostrom, Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer Nava, Executive Vice President Rubin, Interim Senior Vice President Reese, Vice President Brown, Chancellors Block, Christ, Gillman, Hawgood, Khosla, Larive, Muñoz, Wilcox, and Yang, and Recording Secretary Li

2. REMARKS OF THE CHAIR OF THE BOARD

Chair Leib began his remarks by congratulating Regents Lee and Pérez, whom Governor Newsom reappointed for additional 12-year terms. He noted that Regents Kounalakis and Reilly recently participated in the first #CAYleaders Speaker Series event at the UC Student and Policy Center in Sacramento. According to early reporting on fall 2023 admissions, the University has increased its admission of community college students and was on track to increase its enrollment of California resident students. Chair Leib acknowledged the
progress that has been made and commended the efforts of the President, the campuses, the chancellors, and other UC leaders.

Chair Leib highlighted several items in the agenda for this meeting. UC Berkeley Professor and Nobel laureate Jennifer Doudna was slated to make a presentation on clustered regularly interspaced short palindromic repeats (CRISPR) technology in light of recent news that the United Kingdom has become the first nation to approve CRISPR treatment for sickle cell anemia. He thanked Regent Sures, Regent Park, and the Academic Senate for their collaboration on item J1, Adoption of Regents Policy on Public and Discretionary Statements by Academic Units. Given the upcoming presentation before the Academic and Student Affairs Committee, Chair Leib noted that UC astronomers have proven the existence of a supermassive black hole in the center of the Milky Way galaxy, measured the atmosphere of planets orbiting other stars, and illuminated how galaxies have formed since the Big Bang. He expressed appreciation for the work that Provost Newman and her team have done to advance innovation and entrepreneurship and remarked on the University’s recent progress in its intellectual property management and policy efforts, as well as the work of the President’s Entrepreneurship Network Council, which planned to focus on Proof of Concept funding, sectoral networks, and global science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) founders.

Chair Leib provided an update on his work to address the instances of antisemitism on several UC campuses. He expressed appreciation to the chancellors for their response to these despicable acts and stressed that the safety of students remained the Regents’ top concern. In Chair Leib’s view, regardless of the group protesting, the campus must investigate when laws are broken and prosecute when necessary. When protestors on either side violate the student code of conduct, UC needs to investigate and take action, including suspension and expulsion, when warranted. The Board remained committed to ensuring that the University is a safe community for everyone; all individuals should feel safe to walk to class, express their viewpoints, and learn and work in an environment that promotes free expression, respect, and academic freedom. The Board would continue to support President Drake and the chancellors in rejecting hateful acts, and would continue to clearly state that hatred, bigotry, and intimidation will not be allowed at the University.

Chair Leib concluded his remarks by noting a recent article that was posted on the University of California website, “UC Has Sent More Women into Space Than Any Other School in the Solar System.” This achievement was a clear example of the power of the University, its influence, and the opportunities it has provided to countless individuals.

3. REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY

President Drake began his remarks by acknowledging the challenges with campus climate both at the University and across the U.S. in recent months and the challenges campus leaders have faced. There have been protests, demonstrations, and rallies at all UC campuses. While some exchanges have been inflammatory or offensive, almost all have been peaceful except for a handful that were violent and disruptive in ways that violate UC values and principles of community. There have been instances of property damage, hateful
assaults, and antisemitism. Many students, faculty, staff, alumni, Regents, elected officials, and other supporters of the University have voiced concern about campus civility and safety. President Drake was pained to hear that members of the UC community, particularly Jewish members, felt unsafe, excluded, or targeted on campus. He was in regular contact with chancellors and other stakeholders to discuss and respond to these issues, provide resources, and make clear that the UC community must be a safe, welcoming, and inclusive space for all. The University was navigating uncharted territory and listening and adjusting in the process. While specific incidents have dominated the news headlines, it was also important to note the countless peaceful events on UC campuses. However, some discussions, debates, and protests were conducted by those not affiliated with UC and in a manner not consistent with UC values. The UC community overwhelmingly understood and respected the responsibility that comes with exercising one’s First Amendment rights, and UC leaders were working diligently to provide resources and guidance to help the University move through this moment productively and respectfully. President Drake announced that UC would work with Hillel International to launch an educational and training program that would help senior leaders successfully address antisemitism, bigotry, and hatred. Each campus was actively distributing its portion of the $7 million that UC committed in November 2023 to improve campus climate. Last month, the University launched its Systemwide Office of Civil Rights and announced that Catherine Spear would assume her role as inaugural Director in May. The University would keep striving, with input from diverse stakeholders, to be a community where tolerance, inclusiveness, and understanding could thrive.

The University was expanding opportunities for undocumented students who qualified for in-state tuition under Assembly Bill (AB) 540 by offering credit-bearing, experiential learning courses. The Office of the President has provided campuses with one-time funding to expand existing programs and develop new ones. One hoped that UC would offer hundreds more such opportunities next year. President Drake highlighted several items in the agenda for this meeting. He expressed gratitude that the State Budget Act of 2023 provided increases in funding for basic needs, mental health, and rapid rehousing programs. However, UC had significant gaps to address as California and the nation rebound from the economic and health consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic and contend with the increase in the cost of living. One innovative example of addressing basic needs was BruinHubs at UCLA, which provided resources and physical space for commuter students to rest, study, eat, and charge electronic devices. BruinHubs locations were the result of years of research and advocacy. UC continued to work with the State Legislature and Governor Newsom to ensure that next year’s State budget aligned with their shared goals. In a fiscally challenging year for the State, the University was working hard to demonstrate its value and contributions to the state’s economy and communities. President Drake reiterated UC’s commitment before the State Senate Budget and Fiscal Review Committee last week.

President Drake concluded his remarks by congratulating Vice President Maldonado, who was elected President of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. He recognized her leadership of UC’s efforts to advance innovation across UC and to nurture a robust and inclusive research enterprise.
4. **REMARKS OF THE CHAIR OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE**

Faculty Representative Steintrager shared that, having recently served on two chancellor search committees, he was struck by how little room there was for free-flowing conversation and debate but acknowledged equity and bias concerns. He posited a scenario in which a candidate is asked about the principles drawn from the University of Chicago’s 1967 “Report on the University’s Role in Political and Social Action” (Kalven Report), such that it is not the place of university administrative units or administrators to articulate political positions. Mr. Steintrager asked whether these principles would detract from or enhance free speech and academic freedom, and about the role of intellectual engagement and informed debate in a university system or its administration and governance. At the February 14, 2024 meeting of the Board, he presented the Academic Senate’s proposed amendment of its current regulations for academic residency, that all undergraduate students take a minimum of ten percent in-person courses. Also present was Katie Harris, Vice Chair of the Academic Senate’s University Committee on Educational Policy, to answer questions. Provost Newman presented the history of online education, and Chancellor Gillman made remarks on a proposed fully online undergraduate business degree that the systemwide Academic Senate’s regulation had supposedly stifled. Mr. Steintrager stated that there were some inaccuracies and mischaracterizations in both presentations. Board members expressed their observations about the proposed regulation, questions were raised, but neither he nor Ms. Harris were allowed to respond or engage in meaningful dialogue about, for example, whether the regulation had anything to do with educational quality. Mr. Steintrager and other Senate faculty held the view that members of the Board appeared resistant to engaging in discussion. He stated that, while the optics of this were not good, it also presented a serious problem for shared governance. In his first remarks to the Board at the September 2023 meeting, Mr. Steintrager noted that service to the University through the Academic Senate can be less a path to professional advancement than an impediment given lost time for research and teaching. Senate faculty volunteered their time because they believed this to be fundamentally important to the quality of the University. He emphasized the many hours that the Academic Senate spent to formulate, review, analyze, and endorse the proposed amendment to the regulation, as well as the consideration of the Academic Assembly, which was made up largely of elected representatives from each Division of the Academic Senate. The Board appeared to disapprove the item hastily and peremptorily; Mr. Steintrager opined that abstention was a better position than casting an uninformed vote. He had been told that there was concern that a quorum might be lost and that the Board needed to move on to other items, but he believed that neither reason was good enough to foreclose discussion. He has not once questioned the Board’s reserved authority; rather, he questioned the Board’s respect for and understanding of the authorities that the Board delegates to the Senate.

Mr. Steintrager summarized discussions he had had with former systemwide Academic Senate Chairs and other colleagues since the February meeting. First, the topic of unionization has frequently been raised. The Academic Senate was a way of organizing labor. If that was broken, other ways of organizing would begin to seem more sensible, and that could change shared governance. In Mr. Steintrager’s view, it would likely diminish the autonomy and authority of the Board. Second was discussion of an escalating pattern
of Regental diminishment of Senate delegated authorities and respect for shared governance. He cited as examples item J1, *Adoption of Regents Policy on Public and Discretionary Statements by Academic Units*, which came to the Board without Senate review, and a decision on standardized testing and admissions that ran counter to the recommendation of the Senate’s Standardized Testing Task Force (STTF) and the Academic Council. The latter example was coming up more frequently given the number of high-profile universities reinstating the standardized testing requirement out of concern for diversity and student success. The STTF’s report has often been cited as a benchmark study of the problems and advantages of standardized testing. Mr. Steintrager remarked that, when the Senate is asked to study the impact of eliminating standardized testing, faculty, having been asked to do work and make recommendations that are unlikely to be appreciated, might respond with a collective shrug. Third, he has heard colleagues frequently discussing governing boards at other universities that have lost the confidence of their faculty. He remarked that faculty largely disagreed with Chair Leib’s statement during a fall visit to the Academic Council that shared governance was not fraying. Mr. Steintrager asked that Chair Leib address shared governance in his next remarks to the Board, accompanied by concrete commitments that, for instance, Regental policy affecting faculty undergo systemwide Academic Senate review; recommendations from that review be addressed by the Board before the policy is adopted; matters within the authority of the Academic Senate be brought to the Board under its reserved authority rarely and for good cause; and, when a matter within the delegated authority does come to the Board for approval, there be a full and thorough discussion of the item and clear explanation of any variance between the Board and the Senate. Mr. Steintrager believed these to be straightforward steps to take to reaffirm the value of shared governance and to demonstrate some respect for the thoughtful labor of his colleagues.

The meeting adjourned at 1:40 p.m.

Attest:

The Secretary and Chief of Staff