

The Regents of the University of California

ACADEMIC AND STUDENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

May 14, 2025

The Academic and Student Affairs Committee met on the above date at the UCSF-Mission Bay Conference Center, San Francisco campus.

Members present: Regents Anguiano, Batchlor, Beharry, Hernandez, Leib, Pack, Park, Robinson, and Sarris; Advisory members Palazoglu and Wang; Chancellors Gillman, Lyons, Muñoz, Wilcox, and Yang; Staff Advisor Emiru

In attendance: Faculty Representative Cheung, Regents Analyst Sheridan, General Counsel Robinson, Provost Newman, Chancellor Frenk, and Recording Secretary Li

The meeting convened at 3:40 p.m. with Committee Chair Leib presiding.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meeting of March 19, 2025 were approved, Regents Anguiano, Batchlor, Beharry, Hernandez, Leib, Pack, Park, and Sarris voting “aye.”¹

2. APPROVAL OF NEW MULTI-YEAR PLANS FOR PROFESSIONAL DEGREE SUPPLEMENTAL TUITION FOR TEN GRADUATE PROFESSIONAL DEGREE PROGRAMS

The President of the University recommended that the Regents approve the multi-year plans for charging Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) for ten graduate professional degree programs as shown in Display 1.

¹ Roll call vote required by the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act [Government Code §11123(b)(1)(D)] for all meetings held by teleconference.

DISPLAY 1: Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition Levels¹ for Ten Programs

	Current Level		Proposed Level			
	<u>2024-25</u>	<u>2025-26</u>	<u>2026-27</u>	<u>2027-28</u>	<u>2028-29</u>	<u>2029-30</u>
Engineering, Berkeley						
Resident PDST Level	\$33,700	\$33,700	\$33,700	\$33,700	\$33,700	\$33,700
Nonresident PDST Level	\$32,994	\$34,314	\$35,686	\$37,114	\$38,598	\$40,142
Information Management and Systems, Berkeley						
Resident PDST Level	\$9,112	\$9,112	\$9,112	N/A	N/A	N/A
Nonresident PDST Level	\$9,112	\$9,112	\$9,112	N/A	N/A	N/A
Statistics, Berkeley						
Resident PDST Level	\$23,268	\$23,268	\$23,268	\$23,268	\$23,268	\$23,268
Nonresident PDST Level	\$26,592	\$27,922	\$29,318	\$30,784	\$32,322	\$33,938
Translation Medicine, Jt Berkeley and San Francisco						
Resident PDST Level	\$35,154	\$36,210	\$37,290	\$38,414	\$39,560	\$40,748
Nonresident PDST Level	\$35,154	\$36,210	\$37,290	\$38,414	\$39,560	\$40,748
Preventive Veterinary Medicine, Davis						
Resident PDST Level	\$6,243	\$6,243	\$6,432	\$6,627	\$6,828	\$7,035
Nonresident PDST Level	\$6,741	\$6,741	\$6,945	\$7,155	\$7,371	\$7,593
Biomedical and Translational Science, Irvine						
Resident PDST Level	\$14,763	\$15,501	\$16,278	\$17,094	\$17,949	\$18,849
Nonresident PDST Level	\$14,763	\$15,501	\$16,278	\$17,094	\$17,949	\$18,849
Genetic Counseling, UCLA						
Resident PDST Level	\$21,879	\$22,974	\$24,123	\$25,329	\$26,595	\$27,927
Nonresident PDST Level	\$21,879	\$22,974	\$24,123	\$25,329	\$26,595	\$27,927
Medicine, UCLA						
Resident PDST Level	\$30,304	\$30,912	\$31,530	\$32,478	\$33,456	\$34,464
Nonresident PDST Level	\$30,304	\$30,912	\$31,530	\$32,478	\$33,456	\$34,464
Medicine, Riverside						
Resident PDST Level	\$25,944	\$26,724	\$27,525	\$28,350	\$29,202	\$30,078
Nonresident PDST Level	\$25,944	\$26,724	\$27,525	\$28,350	\$29,202	\$30,078
Human Computer Interaction, Santa Cruz						
Resident PDST Level	\$25,509	\$26,787	\$28,125	\$29,532	\$31,008	\$32,556
Nonresident PDST Level	\$25,509	\$26,787	\$28,125	\$29,532	\$31,008	\$32,556

¹ The amounts reflect the maximum PDST levels to be assessed, effective as of the academic year indicated. Assessing PDST levels less than the level indicated requires approval by the President with the concurrence of the Chancellor. PDST levels may be assessed beyond the period covering the program's approved multi-year plan but not in excess of the maximum levels specified in the final year.

[Background material was provided to Regents in advance of the meeting, and a copy is on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Committee Chair Leib stated that he and Regent Anguiano asked that the five programs requesting Professional Degree Supplemental Tuition (PDST) increases of three percent or less be approved as part of a consent agenda. He credited Regent Beharry with all programs' commitment in writing to waive PDST for students eligible for the Native American Opportunity Plan. The Engineering program and the Statistics program at UC Berkeley did not request PDST increases for California residents, but for nonresident students; the former sought a four percent annual increase while the latter sought a five percent annual increase.

Provost Newman noted the end of Regent Beharry's term and thanked him for his advocacy of students.

Regent Sarris expressed his appreciation for Regent Beharry's work related to the Native American Opportunity Plan.

Associate Vice President Kate Glassman introduced the item, a request to approve the PDST plans for ten existing programs. PDST supplemented State support and enabled UC professional schools to maintain and enhance program quality, diversity, and affordability. The approved plans for these programs would expire at the end of the 2024–25 academic year and new plans have been submitted for consideration. Ms. Glassman introduced representatives of the UC Irvine Biomedical and Translational Science program.

Michael Stamos, Dean of the UC Irvine School of Medicine, shared recent changes and renewed goals that one hoped would improve the Master of Science in Biomedical and Translational Science (MS-BATS) program and make it more accessible and affordable. Designed to train healthcare professionals and medical students to interpret and implement research that translates biomedical discoveries into clinical practice, improves the delivery of care, and informs healthcare policy, the MS-BATS program was part of a physician-scientist training pipeline that UCI was creating. Established in 2009, MS-BATS has been supported by PDST for 11 years. Ten students were currently enrolled in the program, and a cohort of 15 out of 40 applicants was anticipated in the coming year. The requested annual PDST increases of five percent over the next five years would facilitate enrollment growth, bolster financial aid, and ensure that the program curriculum harmonizes with the medical school curriculum, which would enable M.D. students to start the MS-BATS program in the summer between their first and second year of study. Four students from the Program in Medical Education for the Latino Community (PRIME-LC) have enrolled in the MS-BATS program to meet their master's degree requirement. The program planned to continue setting aside at least one-third of PDST revenue as financial aid and has committed to waiving PDST for students eligible for the Native American Opportunity Plan. Following the retirement of its inaugural program directors, the MS-BATS program took an admissions hiatus in 2024 and has since condensed the curriculum from two years to one year in order to reduce the total program cost and allow students to enter the workforce sooner. This PDST proposal would ensure the long-term viability of the program and increase the enrollment of California residents.

Ms. Glassman introduced the UCLA Genetic Counseling program.

Emily Quinn, Associate Adjunct Professor and Director of the Master of Science in Genetic Counseling Program at the UCLA David Geffen School of Medicine, stated that the two-year program, which enrolled its first cohort in 2020, trained diverse, well-rounded counselors in clinical genomic medicine. The program enrolled two cohorts of ten students each, and its curriculum included field work experience and independent research to prepare graduates for careers in clinical and laboratory settings, public health, education, and research. The proposed five percent annual increases over the next five years would help the program comply with accreditation requirements, support recruitment efforts, provide financial assistance, and maintain a high-quality curriculum that builds mandated clinical competencies. The program strove to balance the competing objectives of keeping PDST as low as possible with ensuring the program's ability to deliver a modern

professional degree that meets the needs of students and of California. Over the next five years, the program would continue to return one-third of PDST revenues as financial aid, and PDST would be fully covered for at least three students per cohort, with the remainder evenly distributed among the other students. The program would also waive PDST for individuals who are eligible for the Native American Opportunity Plan. PDST, which comprised over 35 percent of the program's operating budget, funded students' advising, professional development, and career support as required by the Accreditation Council for Genetic Counseling. PDST also supported instructional resources such as standardized patients for clinical skills development. The proposed PDST increase would ensure the long-term health of the program and provide instructional support and student services.

Regent Anguiano asked if the program, given its uniqueness, had considered online delivery to provide access to more students, particularly those who cannot move to Los Angeles. Ms. Quinn replied that the program was only accredited to offer an in-person educational experience; this would have to be discussed with the accrediting body. Christina Palmer, Professor and Founding Director, added that clinical placement was an important element of curriculum, so the program would need to make sure that students, wherever they were located, would be able to fulfill that part of the curriculum.

Regent Beharry asked if the program could increase its enrollment of California resident students beyond the 16 proposed for the next five years. Ms. Palmer replied that the program participated in national matching, and that this was a matter of both candidate preferences and program preferences. Each cohort tended to have eight residents and two nonresidents. The program would have to consider changes to internal processes to increase this number.

Regent Beharry expressed his wish to see enrollment increase if a five percent PDST increase is requested. He remarked that, of all the programs being presented today, this program had the biggest gender disparity, and he asked about the program's recruitment of male students. Ms. Quinn replied that gender parity was an issue within the genetic counseling profession and that the program aimed to address it. One goal was to convene focus groups of male-identifying alumni to brainstorm how the program could expand its pipeline and support male-identifying and gender nonconforming students. Ms. Newman added that most programs with clinical placements, even in high-demand professions, faced enrollment limits because of the difficulty of securing those placements.

Ms. Glassman introduced the UC Santa Cruz Human Computer Interaction (HCI) program.

Norman Su, Associate Professor and Vice Chair of the Human Computer Interaction (HCI) M.S. program at UC Santa Cruz, stated this was a four-quarter program operating from UCSC's Silicon Valley campus and enrolled roughly 50 students per year. Students took courses in HCI theory and practice, user research and design methods, prototyping technical build skills, and ethics and activism in technology. The program was designed to foster close collaboration between students and partners from industry and nonprofit organizations, culminating in a capstone project in which students in small teams work with these partners on a real-world project. The HCI program explored the effects of

technology, how people shaped technology to fit their needs, and how technology could be designed to better support people's lives. The program, which was funded entirely by PDST, proposed an annual increase of five percent over the next five years to support faculty and staff, bolster recruitment efforts, provide financial aid, and enhance courses. The program planned to continue setting aside 33 percent of PDST for return-to-aid, use all PDST to assist domestic students with demonstrable need, and waive PDST for all students eligible for the Native American Opportunity Plan. To increase California resident enrollment, the program was focusing its recruiting efforts on California students and planned to award a greater share of return-to-aid to California students. The HCI program has also instituted a policy waiving the admission fees of current undergraduate students and alumni of UC and the California State University. Graduates have become user experience (UX) researchers and product designers for major technology companies.

Regent Hernandez asked how the program came to have a large number of international students and how it would achieve its enrollment targets. Mr. Su acknowledged that the number of international students in the program was an issue of concern and that the use of return-to-aid was a significant strategy to recruit California residents. For California and domestic applicants, how they funded their undergraduate education, financial hardships, and personal history statements were considerations when awarding financial aid. The program has made some inroads; its graduating cohort was comprised of 48 percent California residents, up from 43 percent the prior year.

Regent-designate Wang asked how the HCI program was engaging alumni and external partners. Mr. Su stated that the program's Mentor Coalition paired students with mentors who were experienced UX professionals, some from underrepresented groups, for networking and building portfolios and interview skills. Students were also working with industry sponsors on capstone projects; some of these sponsors were program alumni.

Staff Advisor Emiru asked whether there were efforts to increase the number of faculty from underrepresented groups. Mr. Su stated that the department was concerned about the program's lack of underrepresented faculty. For future faculty recruitment, the program planned to emphasize its focus on social justice, UC Santa Cruz' commitment to recruiting diverse faculty, and the campus' designation as a Minority-Serving Institution. The program has successfully recruited women and people of color as lecturers and graduate student instructors. This was an ongoing effort.

Committee Chair Leib noted that the increases now being proposed were more modest than some increases in the past.

Regent Sarris underscored the high cost of living where UCLA and UC Berkeley were located. Committee Chair Leib stated that one hoped for increases of about three percent to account for inflation, and programs seeking larger increases were invited to present.

Regent Hernandez stressed the importance of student diversity in PDST programs, noting that 95.7 percent of students in the HCI program did not come from underrepresented groups. In his view, student diversity for this program was trending in the wrong direction.

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the Committee approved the President's recommendation and voted to present it to the Board, Regents Anguiano, Batchlor, Beharry, Hernandez, Leib, Pack, Park, and Sarris voting "aye."

3. **QUANTUM INFORMATION SCIENCE: A KEY PRIORITY FOR UC AND THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

[Background material was provided to Regents in advance of the meeting, and a copy is on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Provost Newman introduced the item. The United Nations proclaimed that 2025 was the International Year of Quantum Science and Technology. Leveraging computer science, physics, and mathematical expertise, UC campuses and Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) led the world in quantum information science. Federal investments in this field included the National Quantum Initiative Act of 2018, the White House's Industries of the Future program, and the National Science Foundation's (NSF) Quantum Leap Challenge Institutes. Since the early 1920s, quantum mechanics theory has transformed the understanding of physics, chemistry, and many other sciences. Quantum mechanics formed the basis for the invention of the laser, the transistor, and modern electronics. Quantum entanglement, an aspect of quantum mechanics, could revolutionize computing, precision measurement, drug discovery, and cryptography.

Steven Kahn, Dean of the Division of Mathematical and Physical Sciences at UC Berkeley, explained that, in quantum entanglement, two seemingly separate systems can be intimately coupled even if there is a large distance between them. In a conventional computer, a bit has a value of zero or one; in a quantum computer, a quantum bit or "qubit" could be both zero and one at the same time, enabling many simultaneous calculations using the same qubits. Conventional computing power scaled linearly, while quantum computing scaled exponentially. For instance, 100 qubits could have the equivalent computing power of two to the 100th power of conventional bits. Quantum computers could perform large calculations much more quickly using far less energy and perform calculations not possible with a conventional computer. Quantum entanglement was difficult to maintain given its sensitivity to its isolation from external environments, but this also meant that quantum sensors could make extremely precise measurements of physical properties such as temperature, electromagnetic fields, gravity, and vibration. Quantum sensors were revolutionizing fields like avionics, autonomous vehicles, seismology, and mineral exploration. Quantum simulators could reproduce quantum processes in chemical reactions, which could revolutionize drug discovery.

At present, many different technologies could potentially produce qubits, but they varied greatly and could involve lasers, cryogenics, or advanced material fabrication. It was unknown which technologies would prevail, and it was difficult to forecast how to scale these diverse systems. Large technology companies have invested heavily in quantum computing, but fundamental research at universities and National Laboratories were still key to future progress. UC campuses and LBNL were world leaders in this field, with UC Berkeley and LBNL each winning bids for one of five National Quantum Information

Science Centers. Mr. Kahn presented examples of degree programs and centers dedicated to quantum information science at nine UC campuses, all of which worked closely together. There was much student interest in this emerging field. He also shared a list of centers and test beds at Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory that built on facilities developed at LBNL over the years.

According to projections made by a number of organizations, quantum computing was expected to start delivering value to commercial end users in 2025, with a total impact of over \$70 billion by 2030. Some even projected total impact of \$1 trillion. Mr. Kahn presented a chart from the Quantum Economic Development Consortium depicting the anticipated growth in financial support for quantum computing and the cost reduction as conventional computing is converted to quantum platforms. California had tremendous capability due primarily to UC, but the California Legislature and State government were relatively silent while other states were more proactive in promoting growth and advertising their capabilities to the emerging industry. Illinois invested \$500 million in a “quantum campus,” and there were significant initiatives as well in Maryland, New York, and Colorado in partnership with New Mexico. The latter two sites competed for and were awarded U.S. Department of Commerce designations as Quantum Tech Hubs. Starting last year, several discussions with the State have been quite productive. The bipartisan Assembly Bill 940 would establish quantum innovation zones in California, and the Governor’s office has identified quantum computing as a key priority for California.

Developing a quantum workforce beyond that of computer scientists was of prime concern. Prerequisites for existing courses in physics, chemistry, and computer science were not compatible with the schedules of students interested in this field; a new quantum curriculum was needed. Mr. Kahn presented a chart showing the many skilled professionals whom quantum companies planned to hire over the next five years, but students outside of the field of quantum information science did not know how to apply for these jobs. UC could play a major role in preparing a knowledgeable and engaged quantum workforce, and it needed to consider more significant infrastructure investments as the field matures. Quantum experiments were very sensitive to environmental conditions such as air handling, humidity, vibrations, and stray electromagnetic fields. Physics, chemistry, and engineering buildings on UC campuses were not built for these types of experiments, and retrofitting laboratories on an individual basis has been costly and inefficient.

Ms. Newman emphasized the importance of this effort. The University needed to continue coordinating with State government and industry to realize the promise of this technology. Early discussions with State and federal officials have been successful. Ms. Newman reiterated the need for additional educational opportunities and new infrastructure.

Regent Hernandez asked whether UC infrastructure supported all quantum technologies or a particular one that UC deemed likely to prevail. Mr. Kahn explained that large companies that recruited experts based on the technologies they chose later realized that their choices were not necessarily correct. The University had breadth that other institutions did not have, as UC faculty covered all the technologies. With this breadth, UC could offer a forum to discuss the progress of the various technologies.

Chancellor Gillman highlighted the work of chemist Roy Eddleman (1940–2022), who committed tens of millions of dollars to this effort through the quantum institutes he established at UC Irvine, UCSB, and the California Institute of Technology (CalTech). UCI alone had 27 quantum scientists across multiple fields. The continuing work of these institutes and Mr. Eddleman’s foundation could be shared with State officials.

Chancellor Yang shared his experience with Nobel Committees for UCSB’s six Nobel Laureates; they were looking not for the best but for the first in a field and the rich consequences thereafter. John Clauser, one of three winners of the Nobel Prize in Physics in 2022 for quantum entanglement, conducted quantum experiments as a postdoctoral researcher at UC Berkeley in the 1970s. Mr. Kahn added that Mr. Clauser had conducted the experiments using borrowed equipment; his curiosity has led to a burgeoning industry.

Regent-designate Wang asked how campuses were collaborating to create a united approach to educational infrastructure and legislative advocacy. Mr. Kahn replied that UCLA, UCSB, and UCI were partnering with UC Berkeley and contributing to the NSF-funded National Quantum Information Science Center, and the U.S. Department of Energy–funded center at LBNL was also represented by many campuses. Work at UC Davis was tied to both centers as well. Stanford University and CalTech were also leaders in this work. Given the range of technologies, these various institutions complemented each other in their work in this field. Mr. Kahn has appealed to State leaders that California needed to maintain its technological leadership.

Regent-designate Wang asked how bipartisan support was being leveraged. Ms. Newman reiterated Mr. Kahn’s advocacy delegations in Sacramento. Quantum information science was one of few things that had national bipartisan support. Ms. Newman was hopeful that the infrastructure and industrial planning commitments that were characteristic of the Biden administration would continue.

Regent-designate Wang asked if there were barriers that the Regents could help address. Mr. Kahn stated that UC was trying to establish a deeper connection with industry and a partnership with the State. UC Berkeley was creating an interaction space on campus that would be open to industry partners. Infrastructure investments would be needed to reach the capability for fabricating qubits and assembling devices.

Chancellor Frenk stated that one of the initial anchor tenants at UCLA Research Park would be the UCLA Center for Quantum Science and Engineering. According to some donors, universities would not be able to match the vast sums of money that major technology companies known as the “Magnificent Seven” were investing into quantum information science, and the only pathway for universities would be through partnership. Chancellor Frenk also noted current threats to federal research funding. He asked how UC could be a part of the entire downstream value chain instead of falling into irrelevance or being confined to very basic research. Mr. Kahn shared his view that changes have occurred in the last several years. The investments made by Amazon, Google, IBM, and Microsoft in various technologies did not yield the progress they expected, while the technologies developed at universities fared better. Mr. Kahn believed that this work would move out of

the universities once the prevailing technology is found, but UC had two advantages in the meantime. First, UC hired a wide range of faculty, and second, UC could be an honest broker. The focus was now on physical hardware, but many software questions would arise in the future. Companies would be formed from fundamental research conducted at UC campuses. This presented a good opportunity for academia and the National Laboratories, but it would be difficult for universities to keep pace in the future, so UC must act now.

Ms. Newman asked about opportunities for rapid computing that does not consume much energy. Mr. Kahn stated that, given current projections for artificial intelligence (AI), powering and cooling computers could account for half of the world's energy consumption by 2040. In contrast, quantum computing would need fewer bits and could be contained in much smaller facilities. In his view, this was the only way to escape the energy catastrophe.

4. **UPDATE ON FACULTY DISCIPLINE AND DISMISSAL POLICIES AND PROCEDURES: JOINT SENATE-ADMINISTRATION WORKGROUP RECOMMENDATIONS**

[Background material was provided to Regents in advance of the meeting, and a copy is on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Committee Chair Leib shared that he and Regents Anguiano and Sarris met with Faculty Representative Cheung over the last two months to discuss changes to faculty discipline.

Committee Chair Leib invited Student Observer Audrey Jacobs to make remarks.

Ms. Jacobs stated that, while it is important that faculty discipline proceedings do not take longer than necessary, she was deeply concerned that due process would no longer be prioritized and faculty would be unjustly punished if deadlines are set and exceptions are allowed on a case-by-case basis. The current time frame for the disciplinary process ensured that all parties and evidence are considered before a conclusion is made and a sanction is chosen. Ms. Jacobs urged the Regents to consider the ramifications of shortening this period of time and to prioritize due process and protection of faculty rights. She shared the view that changes to the faculty discipline process were being made in retaliation for the pro-Palestine stance many faculty have taken. Taking action against freedom of speech and academic freedom was an unacceptable response to a viewpoint with which Regents personally disagreed. During the January meeting, Provost Newman had stated that additional funds would be needed to shorten the timeframe for faculty discipline. Ms. Jacobs asked whence these funds would be drawn. She stated that the Regents must clearly communicate how tuition and University dollars are being used to silence and punish faculty with viewpoints contrary to those of the Regents. She stated that this agenda item attempted to encroach upon and limit faculty's academic freedom and expressed concern about the following quote from Attachment B of the written materials: "Even if the faculty member speaks in their private capacity in extramural speech, their free speech rights may be weighed against the impact on the University's interests and mission. The key consideration is whether the conduct is not justified by the faculty's ethical principles stated in APM - 015 and significantly impairs the University's central

functions. If so, then it may be subject to discipline.” Ms. Jacobs stated that this left much ambiguity regarding the private speech of faculty members, even if it occurs off campus or outside of working hours. She asked if faculty members can share their own opinions on social media or if they are compelled to comply with their employer’s views. She asked who can decide whether speech is within the University’s interest and mission, and which elements of UC’s interest and mission are at stake. The University presented itself as content-neutral, but monitoring and limiting faculty and student self-representation was at odds with UC’s mission and purpose. If UC decides to proceed with these policy changes, it should consider how they are not misused in the future to stifle dissent. Ms. Jacobs cited an example from her own coursework in Asian American Studies at UC Davis. She was taught to draw connections between social movements, especially those relevant to a modern context. In the months following October 2023, many of her courses included discussion of the Israel-Palestine conflict. In light of proposed policy changes, she asked whether this would be considered material unrelated to the course, faculty inserting a personal stance, or the inclusion of a modern context. Incorporating relevant current events into coursework was one way to prepare students for entry into the workforce but might no longer be possible with the enforcement of vague and open-ended policies that could be applied according to the wishes of the Regents. She asked if identifying what was occurring in Gaza as a genocide would be considered political discrimination against Zionist students under the proposed policy changes. Antisemitism, while present across college campuses, has been used to silence anti-Zionist viewpoints, and anti-Zionism has been conflated with antisemitism. As a Jewish student herself, Ms. Jacobs stated that the discussion of anti-Zionism and the Israel-Palestine conflict in class has never once made her feel unsafe or discriminated against, but there were countless stories of Zionist Jewish students claiming antisemitism on the basis of anti-Zionism, subjecting faculty to disciplinary hearings. This would be exacerbated if the policy changes are adopted, harming faculty who are only doing their job by teaching about the Israel-Palestine conflict. Ms. Jacob again urged the Regents to consider the ramifications of the proposed policy changes and to clarify that they would not be used to stifle faculty speech.

Committee Chair Leib explained that the Regents involved did not focus specifically on the Israel-Palestine conflict, but rather the length of time of the faculty discipline process.

Regent Anguiano shared that the reforms made to the University’s Sexual Violence and Sexual Harassment (SVSH) Policy to quicken the discipline process were viewed as a best practice.

Committee Chair Leib clarified that that a vote would not be taken today.

Provost Newman stated that this was a discussion and recommendations from an Academic Senate-administration workgroup. If the Regents are comfortable with these recommendations, they would be subject to systemwide review for 30 days. It is standard to ensure that procedures are well accepted across UC campuses and that faculty and students are well protected. Ms. Newman opined that the process by which the workgroup arrived at these recommendations could be a model for future actions. All concerns that were raised were taken into account. In January, the Board requested a review of all policies

and procedures for faculty discipline, with an emphasis on the timely completion of cases. The workgroup, co-chaired by Dr. Cheung and Interim Vice Provost Douglas Haynes and comprised of ten faculty, ten campus administrators, and representatives from UC Legal, reviewed and analyzed a large volume of documents and surveys and consulted with the Academic Senate's University Committee on Privilege and Tenure (UCPT), Systemwide Academic Personnel, the Systemwide Office of Civil Rights, the Office of Ethics, Compliance and Audit Services (ECAS), campus academic personnel offices, and experts across UC to develop these recommendations. The workgroup sent draft recommendations to the chairs of UCPT and the Academic Senate's University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) for review. The workgroup kept Ms. Newman well informed about its progress and reevaluated some preliminary recommendations following her feedback. Suggestions from Committee Chair Leib and Regents Anguiano and Sarris were also incorporated.

Faculty Representative Cheung stated that the workgroup developed systemwide calibration guidelines for greater consistency in the administration of discipline for misconduct related to expressive activities. These guidelines would provide advisory committees and decision makers with benchmarks for recommending and approving disciplinary sanctions based on several factors. The first factor, the severity of misconduct, was divided into three tiers of conduct linked to violations of the Academic Personnel Manual (APM) – 015, or the Faculty Code of Conduct, and faculty time, place, and manner (TPM) policies. The second factor, the severity of the impact, gauged the conduct's impact on or damage to UC property or community members, as well as the conduct's harm to others by physical or other means. The third factor was whether there were mitigating or aggravating factors. The workgroup included a companion document with additional context, guidance, and hyperlinks to policies. If the Board accepts the draft guidelines, both the Academic Senate and the administration would distribute them for a 30-day systemwide review, with the goal of finalizing the document by the July Regents meeting.

The workgroup was asked to evaluate options and develop recommendations for handling a situation in which a campus Privilege and Tenure (P&T) hearing panel cannot be convened when faculty members are unable or unwilling to serve. Ms. Newman asked the workgroup to consider the value of a systemwide P&T committee. After the workgroup explored multiple models and solicited feedback from past and current P&T members, the workgroup recommended the creation of a standing Systemwide Network P&T Committee comprised of members of campus P&T hearing panels who would be ready to hear cases if a campus panel cannot be appointed within 14 days of the chancellor filing disciplinary charges. Faculty from the respondent's campus could consult and provide expertise on campus procedures, norms, atmosphere, and culture, as well as the conduct in question. The workgroup concluded that the hearing process for discipline cases has generally been timely and rigorous, and that the majority of cases would still be heard locally. For those cases that are delayed or where a P&T hearing panel is difficult to appoint, the workgroup believes that a systemwide committee would be important.

The workgroup asked whether campus procedures should be aligned across the system and if there are any processes or procedures not required by policy and that could be eliminated.

The workgroup did not recommend exact replication of procedures across the system due to differences in campus structure but believed that campuses should still adhere to the same procedural timelines. An initial assessment should be completed within 30 business days, the investigation and report should be completed within 120 business days, and disciplinary charges should be filed within 40 business days, at the conclusion of the investigation report. These time limits were consistent with those in the Abusive Conduct in the Workplace and SVSH policies and could be extended only for good cause consistent with guidelines of the Systemwide Office of Civil Rights. The workgroup also recommended that only one investigation should occur for all allegations of misconduct in a single case and that one office be designated as responsible for conducting the investigation; all other interested offices and groups should be consulted by the investigator. In partnership with UC police departments, information should be shared in all misconduct cases according to systemwide guidelines. Currently, such a partnership only existed for SVSH cases.

Mr. Haynes recalled that, at the January meeting, presenters discussed the potential benefits of expanding the current systemwide case tracking system. The workgroup found that expanding the system to include all misconduct cases and capturing intake data for real-time data monitoring would be expensive. Until UC could expand the system to include such on-demand data access, the workgroup recommended that all campuses agree on a set of common data fields that would be used in reporting to Systemwide Academic Personnel and the Regents.

The workgroup was asked to consider whether the P&T hearing panel or the chancellor has the authority to replace a proposed sanction with a more severe penalty. Currently, neither could increase the severity of discipline without starting the disciplinary process over. The workgroup recognized the hearings as a source of information about appropriate discipline and recommended that the administration send a range of sanctions in its notice of proposed discipline to a faculty member. No policy revision would need to occur as this was already permitted. The range of sanctions should be proportionate to the conduct alleged, the facts of the case, the investigation's findings, and the potential testimony and evidence to be presented at the P&T hearing. The chancellor would retain authority to assess these factors and determine the appropriate range of sanctions included in the notice. The guidelines and companion document would be valuable for establishing the range of minimum and maximum sanctions for a particular infraction.

The workgroup was asked to clarify the circumstances under which paid leave and unpaid leave should be used during the disciplinary process. A chancellor may place a faculty member on involuntary leave with pay prior to a finding of a policy violation. Once an investigation has concluded with a finding that a policy violation has occurred, suspension without pay may be imposed. In June 2024, the Board determined that when chancellors recommend dismissal of a faculty member with tenure or secured employment under APM – 016 to the President, chancellors should also suspend the faculty member without pay. Per the existing APM - 016 language, more than one sanction may be applied. Provost Newman notified the faculty and the administration of this change. Since then, campuses have been imposing suspension without pay when they recommend dismissal to the

president and Regents. While awaiting action from the President and Regents, the faculty member no longer has paid status and is no longer working for the University. Mr. Haynes presented a list of places and offices where members of the UC community may raise concerns and seek guidance if they believe that faculty have engaged in misconduct.

Committee Chair Leib asked for information indicating where the proposed changes occur in the policy ahead of the July meeting.

Regent Sarris emphasized that the University was not reacting to current events, but rather engaging in broad consideration related to sexual harassment. He agreed with Regent Anguiano's comment that UC was seeking best practices and a way to expedite the process and to provide clarity. This was not about sanctioning faculty and students.

Regent Anguiano added that the Regents had discussed a fair and equitable process and a comprehensive review of that process, and she believed that the recommendations achieved both. She thanked Academic Senate faculty.

Committee Chair Leib stated that the vast majority of faculty do not need to undergo the disciplinary process. Cases involving sexual harassment and other matters needed good deadlines and a tightened process.

Regent Beharry offered context for this item, adding that he would be saddened if it is misinterpreted. When this matter was initially raised, the Regents were presented with a faculty member who was not present to teach class. He recalled Committee Chair Leib's comment that students suffer when the disciplinary process takes a long time. This item was student-centered. Regent Beharry emphasized Committee Chair Leib's dedication to ensuring that students' education is prioritized.

Committee Chair Leib requested a discussion at a future meeting about significant intrusion of material unrelated to the course, one type of conduct deemed unacceptable in the Faculty Code of Conduct. He had received many complaints from students on both sides of the issue who felt that activity in the classroom or class cancellations last year had been related to protest encampments. Committee Chair Leib stated that he was a proud Zionist. He wished to ensure that, if students feel there has been a violation of this section, they have a right to submit a report and a process for review. He also wished to understand the process.

Committee Chair Leib stated his understanding that the matter of faculty discipline would return before the Regents in July. Dr. Cheung replied that he, Ms. Newman, and the workgroup would work together to clarify the process. One must also need to adhere to the due process of faculty and to ensure that processes are fair for both students and faculty.

Ms. Newman asked whether there was approval from the Regents to pursue a systemwide review. Committee Chair Leib replied that while a vote could not be taken, he observed a clear response from most of the Regents present. Ms. Newman stated that the 30-day systemwide review would proceed.

5. **BOARD OF ADMISSIONS AND RELATIONS WITH SCHOOLS UPDATE ON ENGAGEMENT WITH CALIFORNIA K–12**

[Background material was provided to Regents in advance of the meeting, and a copy is on file in the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff.]

Provost Newman introduced the item, a discussion of new forms of consultation with the K–12 and State partners regarding University admissions, as well as mechanisms to ensure that such forms consultation are made permanent. There was a strong desire to make all partners aware of these recommendations so they could share their input.

Faculty Representative Cheung stated that the Academic Senate enjoyed delegated authority by the Regents to determine the conditions for UC undergraduate admissions. The Board of Admissions and Relations with Schools (BOARS) engaged in this work with K–12 leaders. Since the COVID-19 pandemic, UC has codified a commitment to and clarified procedures for K–12 consultation on matters related to admissions.

Deborah Swenson, UC Davis Professor of Economics and Chair of BOARS, reported that, last year, BOARS proposed updates to the definition of courses that students may take to fulfill the University’s academic requirements for admission, raising concerns among some State legislators that UC admissions criteria were being revised without consultation with the State Board of Education. In response, at the start of the 2024–25 academic year, BOARS began planning to meet with the State Board of Education President Linda Darling-Hammond, who visited BOARS in early 2025 with Ms. Newman. During that meeting, they agreed to work toward more effective information sharing and collaboration with the State’s K–12 system. Review of prior K–12 consultations informed discussions over several months. As a result of these discussions, BOARS proposed revisions to the Academic Senate Bylaws, which were approved by the Assembly of the Academic Senate on April 23. The relevant Bylaw now stated that: “The committee shall consult with representatives from the State Board of Education and K–12 subject matter specialists on proposed changes to course requirements for undergraduate admissions. The committee shall confer as needed with representatives of University campus schools and colleges on appropriate scholastic matters.” As before, the Bylaw required BOARS to “compile information on curricula and scholarship standards in California secondary schools.” This practice has informed how BOARS has shaped the A–G criteria that would best position incoming UC students for academic success. BOARS has developed guidelines that would direct how the committee would engage with K–12 partners. They emphasized transparency and the timely sharing of information, clarified procedures, and would foster greater collaboration. The guidelines would also elaborate on the process for K–12 policy consultation for any proposed changes to A–G requirements. Information gained from this consultation would inform BOARS’ recommendations to the Academic Senate. If the Senate approves such recommendations, this consultation would also shape proposals reviewed by the President and Board of Regents per Regents Policy 2102: Policy on Undergraduate Admissions.

Regent Beharry expressed disappointment in the decision not to add an ethnic studies requirement to the A–G criteria. He would prefer to see such a requirement given the necessity for such instruction in this country at this time.

Committee Chair Leib noted current bills related to this issue currently being considered in the State Legislature. He asked whether these changes would be enough such that legislation would no longer be necessary. Dr. Cheung responded that, with clear codification within the Bylaws, there would be no misunderstanding or confusion about consultation with the K–12 system and the State Board of Education. Clarified procedures for consultation would be published soon. Dr. Cheung expressed hope that the Legislature would deem it more than satisfactory. UC could always be better but has taken a very large step forward.

Regent Park expressed appreciation for the resolution and remarked that it belonged in the Senate Bylaws. She emphasized that maintaining this relationship is of the utmost importance. UC was a very large organization with many layers of governance, which could produce challenges of communication. This topic had been covered multiple times within the past year during the Area C discussion, and the Regents strenuously advised this sort of collaboration. She expressed disappointment that it did not happen at that time. In her view, it should not take the introduction of legislative bills for the University to pay attention to the need for collaboration. Regent Park advised that UC should act without legislative intervention and that institutionalists make sure that the Bylaws are not forgotten. Ms. Newman regarded as archaeological the investigation into what became of practices that had been so common in the past. She emphasized the importance of adding practices to Bylaws, given the effect of changing committee membership on institutional knowledge.

Regent Park acknowledged that the Regents were regularly subject to leadership change as well and the same challenges. One could not afford to lose what is important. Ms. Swenson stated that BOARS was committed to these changes. One new element in the guidelines was a plan to meet with the State Board of Education or a designate at the beginning of the year, during which BOARS could share its priorities for the year. BOARS could meet again with the State Board of Education if the latter wish to engage with certain priorities.

Regent Anguiano stressed the inequitable access to A–G courses across the state while hundreds of thousands of K–12 students relied on A–G courses to access higher education. It was incumbent on the University to have an admissions process that is inclusive and accounts for K–12 needs. Regent Anguiano wished to have a better understanding of the process of Regental engagement on matters that require Regental approval. She asked how to ensure that the Academic and Student Affairs Committee and K–12 counterparts are engaged throughout such a process. Ms. Swenson stated that she did not expect recommendations from BOARS for any changes in the near future. However, BOARS should be able to provide the Regents with information about what was being discussed. Dr. Cheung added that he and Faculty Representative Palazoglu were committed to dialogue with the Regents, a practice that Mr. Palazoglu intended to continue during his term as Chair of the Academic Senate. If a change to A–G requirements or the admissions

process is being considered, Dr. Cheung believed that it is incumbent upon the Academic Senate Chair to inform the Chair of the Academic and Student Affairs Committee.

Regent Sarris stated that discussion could be agendized. He thanked BOARS for its work. Mr. Palazoglu affirmed Dr. Cheung's comments, adding that the Academic Senate worked under a principle of "no surprises."

Committee Chair Leib noted that the three bills currently in the Legislature could be amended, and he did not know whether these Bylaw changes were enough to satisfy the Legislature. Ms. Newman shared that she provided several testimonies in Sacramento over the last several weeks and offered to speak to specific legislators if that was deemed necessary. She believed that the University should give them an update.

Committee Chair Leib suggested speaking to Assemblymembers Mike Fong, Al Muratsuchi, Sharon Quirk-Silva, and Darshana Patel. Ms. Newman stated that she had seen them repeatedly but would meet with them again. Committee Chair Leib remarked that legislators were reacting to a lack of coordination.

The meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.

Attest:

Secretary and Chief of Staff