

**THE REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA**  
September 17, 2025

The Regents of the University of California met on the above date at the UCSF-Mission Bay Conference Center, San Francisco campus.

Members present: Regents Anguiano, Batchlor, Brooks, Chu, Cohen, Elliott, Komoto, Kounalakis, Lee, Leib, Makarechian, Milliken, Myers, Park, Reilly, Sarris, Sures, and Wang

In attendance: Regents-designate Craven, Melton, and Tokita, Faculty Representatives Palazoglu and Scott, Secretary and Chief of Staff Lyall, General Counsel Robinson, Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer Brostrom, Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer Nava, Executive Vice President Rubin, Senior Vice President Turner, Vice Presidents Brown, Gullatt, Kao, and Maldonado, Chancellors Assanis, Frenk, Gillman, Hawgood, Hu, Khosla, Larive, Lyons, May, and Muñoz, and Recording Secretary Li

The meeting convened at 8:30 a.m. with Chair Reilly presiding.

**1. PUBLIC COMMENT**

Chair Reilly thanked those who signed up for public comment. Their voices, perspectives, and passion were a reminder of why this work was so vital. The Board of Regents valued public input, the sharing of diverse viewpoints, and the exchange of ideas.

Chair Reilly addressed the killing of Charles James “Charlie” Kirk (1993–2025) at Utah Valley University the prior week, which she regarded as disturbing and shocking, and she expressed condolences to the Kirk family and all those affected by this incident. This was a time when political perspectives often clashed and heated debate was the way of democracy. The university campus is not only a platform for learning, but also a stage on which society’s biggest and most important ideas are debated, vetted, and tested. Free speech and spirited dialogue are the greatest tradition of any university; they are fundamental and must be preserved. Chair Reilly exhorted all at the University of California to commit to never letting the stage of ideas cross over into violence and to commit to the creation of a safe zone where dialogue and debate occur with respect and integrity. She asked that the public comment period be approached with both the passion that many of these issues warrant and the respect they deserve, and that all listen with empathy and work together to address concerns and support the University community.

Chair Reilly 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. Jason Rabinowitz, Secretary-Treasurer of Teamsters Local 2010, addressed the lawsuit that Teamsters Local 2010 and other UC unions filed the prior day in response to actions by the Trump administration. Mr. Rabinowitz stated that these actions threatened workers' jobs and freedoms. Workers called on the University to stand with them and not to capitulate, not to pay proposed settlements as it would undermine UC's ability to fund programs and pay employees, and not to restrict free speech, which would undermine workers' right to strike, rally, and speak out.
- B. Catherine Cobb, President of Teamsters Local 2010, stated that Teamsters Local 2010 and other UC unions filed a lawsuit against the Trump administration to challenge its use of frivolous lawsuits to seek settlements from UC. Ms. Cobb stated that the federal government's actions attempted to hold funds hostage, extract public money, and force its agenda on the University, including restrictions on the ability to protest. Teamsters Local 2010 demanded that UC stand with workers, students, and the community and fight these attacks rather than settle. Ms. Cobb stated that settlement would represent a failure of courage and leadership.
- C. Dianna Sahhar, UC Irvine staff member and member of the Teamsters Local 2010 Clerical and Allied Services (CX) Unit bargaining team, recalled that founding UCI Chancellor Daniel G. Aldrich (1918–1990) invited one to leave UCI better than one found it. Ms. Sahhar, who has worked at the UCI Libraries for over 35 years, stated that she had been promised full healthcare and retirement benefits for life when she began work there in 1990. She had learned from other unions that UC now planned to offer uncapped healthcare premiums and a \$100 monthly stipend, which she contrasted with UC's acquisition of hospitals and its new healthcare facilities. She implored the Regents to honor their commitment to workers and to give them the benefits they earned.
- D. Jocelyn Rodriguez, UCLA graduate student, Student Advocate to the Regent (StAR), and Hispanic-Serving Institution (HSI) Fellow, called for the prevention of research funding cuts, the protection of undocumented students, and continued support for HSIs. She asked that students' well-being be prioritized when UC considers its next steps. She and her colleagues were afraid of what would happen to the research community. Some undocumented students have withdrawn from UC or moved to off-campus housing. Ms. Rodriguez stated that undocumented students needed support through programming, staffing, and legal representation. She emphasized that the HSI mission was equity for all students.
- E. Mohit Saraswat, UC Merced graduate student and StAR, stated that undocumented graduate and international students faced deep uncertainty about their ability to work or complete their degrees. While the University cannot rewrite immigration laws, it could decide whether to stand with and support students. Mr. Saraswat suggested that UC could enact policies allowing students to continue their studies when their immigration or work status is disrupted. He and other students wished to continue contributing to the University's excellence but needed UC's leadership and partnership to ensure that every graduate student could thrive.

F. Maia Bailey, UCSF staff member and member of the Teamsters Local 2010 CX Unit bargaining team, stated that UCSF prioritized parking for patients and visitors, leaving staff to park across town and arrive at worksites by shuttle or public transit. A number of staff were commuting from other cities and counties. Ms. Bailey stated that longer commutes, more time away from families, return-to-work mandates, and new timekeeping requirements were punitive. If staff arrived at work late, more stressed, and less rested, patient appointments would still be delayed, and quality of care would still be affected. These were “lose-lose” outcomes.

G. Marina Jurich, UC San Diego staff member and member of the Teamsters Local 2010 CX Unit bargaining team, called for a cap on healthcare premiums at a time of high inflation and low wages. As someone with medical concerns and a single source of income, Ms. Jurich could not afford to spend more on health insurance and copayments. Most UC workers lived modestly but still struggled to keep pace with the cost of living in California. She called on the University to increase pay and keep health care affordable, noting UC’s many funding sources and reserves.

H. Kat Colato, UCLA staff member and member of the Teamsters Local 2010 CX Unit bargaining team, stated that she and many other younger UC staff were struggling to cover expenses. Staff believed that full-time employment at UC would help them repay their student loans and support their families, but many had to take second jobs to pay bills and rent. She stated that UC must espouse the greatness and excellence that her generation strives for.

I. Ricardo Miranda, UC San Diego student and StAR, spoke in opposition to the proposed changes to the cohort tuition model. While students would continue to seek admission into the University, they might not be able to afford a UC education. Financial aid offers were often delayed and did not cover students’ needs, so students took out loans that they could not afford to repay. In Mr. Miranda’s community, UC was known for its prestige and promise, but questions about the value of a UC education have been replaced with questions of affordability. He stated that the proposed tuition increases in the model could push students into housing and food insecurity and debt.

J. Jasi Bermejo, UCLA student and StAR, expressed fear under the Trump administration as a Filipina woman raised by an immigrant single mother. She urged the University to protect student-initiated programs, which provided academic support to address gaps in student outcomes. These programs helped raise the four-year graduation rate for Filipino(a) students at UCLA from 16 percent in 1980 to over 80 percent at present. Citing President Milliken’s and Chancellor Frenk’s calls to defend academic freedom and protect the University, Ms. Bermejo expressed disappointment that UCLA promoted its impact on the greater community and its defense of research funding while devaluing student-initiated programs. These programs would supplement retention and access services amidst undergraduate enrollment growth.

K. Abigail Verino, UC Berkeley student, Associated Students of the University of California (ASUC) President, and StAR, expressed deep concern about the recent disclosure of students' names to the U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights. ASUC and the UCB Graduate Assembly asked that UC uphold its values and protect students' privacy, defend academic freedom, and support the students whose names were released. UC must stand by its students, who sustain its mission of teaching, research, and service. ASUC and the UCB Graduate Assembly urged the Office of the President (UCOP) to establish a clear structure to ensure that campuses are part of the decision-making process in moments such as these.

L. Jason Perez, UCLA staff member and member of the Teamsters Local 2010 CX Unit bargaining team, stated that UC management received annual bonuses of up to hundreds of thousands of dollars while their direct reports did not receive bonuses and had to fight for wage increases. Mr. Perez stated that management harassed workers to do more while management received recognition and he asked how this was fair. The union asked the UC system to give workers a living wage.

M. Jennifer Carrero, UC Merced staff member and member of the Teamsters Local 2010 CX Unit bargaining team, stated that UCM became a Research 1 (R1) institution because of its staff but would not provide them with a decent wage. Many staff lived from paycheck to paycheck and struggled to meet basic needs. Ms. Carrero shared that she had to advocate for insurance to cover her cancer surgery and for testing to be approved, and she had to commit to paying \$1,500 per shot so that treatment would not be interrupted. Staff deserved to be able to buy a house, go on vacation, and address health needs without going bankrupt.

N. Sarah Harker, UC Santa Cruz alumna and staff member and member of the Teamsters Local 2010 CX Unit bargaining team, shared an incident in which an international student lost housing because UC did not provide the student with a translator to explain the situation. Ms. Harker stated that multilingual employees were vital to students' health, well-being, and success and could help reduce harm. While State and County employees were paid for their bilingual skills, Ms. Harker expressed disappointment that UC only compensated medical employees for their bilingual skills, as they were not the only staff at UC who handled crises.

O. Sarah Dowiri, UCLA student and Vice President of UCLA's Muslim Student Association, shared her experience on campus as a Muslim student. During Ramadan, Ms. Dowiri was told that she was not allowed to briefly step outside of the midterm examination room to break her fast with some water. The only available space for prayer was an outdoor tent that flooded when it rained, and there were no halal dining options on campus. This experience reflected the reality of many Muslim students. Ms. Dowiri asked for adequate multi-faith prayer spaces, expanded halal dining, and clear implementation of California Education Code Section 92640 to ensure that religious accommodations are respected in syllabi.

P. Melanie Brazzell, UC Santa Barbara graduate and postdoctoral research fellow at UC Berkeley, called on the Regents to protect transgender and nonbinary students. Melanie identified as nonbinary and had received gender-affirming care within the UC system. For many transgender students, such care has been lifesaving because they would not have been able to continue as students otherwise. Melanie expressed deep concern about students' ability to continue to receive gender-affirming care given the pressure that the Trump administration was placing on universities to eliminate or deny the existence of transgender people.

Q. Peyrin Kao, UC Berkeley lecturer, stated that he had been on a hunger strike for 22 days to protest starvation, Phase 5 famine (per Integrated Food Security Phase Classification), and genocide in Gaza. He learned that he was among 160 individuals whose names were provided by UCB to the federal government, and he and his family were worried about his safety. In his view, this was not related to antisemitism but rather was capitulation to the Trump administration. Mr. Kao called on the Regents to divest from war, genocide, and forced starvation; to protect students and staff; and to speak with Palestinians and their allies.

R. Daniel Neuhauser, UCLA professor and representative of the Jewish Faculty Resilience Group (JFrg), noted that, according to a report that Interim Chancellor Hunt had given during the November 2024 meeting, no student, staff, or faculty member received discipline despite hundreds of complaints filed following on-campus protests in 2024. JFrg asked about the status of these complaints and called on the Regents to produce a summary of investigation and discipline outcomes. Past cases must not be neglected, but rather analyzed, acknowledged, and rectified.

S. Oluwatosin Jegede, UCSD researcher, stated that a feature of education and research was the employment of teaching assistants and graduate student researchers. He called on the University to prioritize the employment of key student staff and to protect education.

T. Averie Roice, UCLA student, stated that the Trump administration's demands on UCLA attacked transgender and international students and infringed upon students' free speech and protest rights. She added that UC must not remain silent or complicit, and that all students, including transgender, gender nonconforming, and international students, deserved respect, care, and unwavering support. The University must ensure that students are protected against these attacks. Ms. Roice expressed her disappointment in UC's past actions related to divestment, labor justice, and other issues. She called on UC not to appease the rich but to support UC workers who have brought suit against the Trump administration.

U. James Woolery, UCLA student, exhorted the University not to give in to the Trump administration's settlement demands, which would target vulnerable students and discourage inclusion on campus. He warned that students would not be able to seek health care, afford an education, or speak about life experiences in college applications. Diversity was a key component of the UC experience. The settlement

demands also threatened the academic freedom of the University. Mr. Woolery urged UC to explore other avenues and to fight these demands.

- V. Susan Orlofsky, UCSD retiree, stated that 21 UC constituent groups, which included unions and faculty associations, filed suit on behalf of 100,000 employees to stop federal funding cuts that would illegally coerce the University into suppressing free speech and academic freedom, implementing harmful policies on behalf of the Trump administration, and otherwise violating the rights of students, faculty, and staff guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution and State law. Ms. Orlofsky implored the University not to comply.
- W. Chelsea Shover-Darling, UCLA faculty member, addressed item C1, *University of California Compliance with State Assembly Bill 481*, and expressed concern that military-grade weapons would be used by UC police against students and faculty. She urged the Regents not to capitulate to the Trump administration's demands, which would hamper academic freedom and progress and would drive faculty and students to other institutions. In addition, refusal to recognize transgender identity would be devastating to her, her wife, and others.
- X. Joanna Fernandez, UCSF staff member and member of AFSCME 3299, stated that 70 percent of the union's members could not afford to rent a one-bedroom apartment close to where they work. One member from UCSC drained her life savings to move out of her rental home of 16 years to housing farther from campus and took a second job to rebuild savings. The University contributed to this problem by providing housing benefits to its highest-paid workers but not its lowest-paid ones. Ms. Fernandez stated that, like UC's motto, "fiat lux," workers deserve to their keep lights on.
- Y. Ryan Coryea, UC San Diego student, recalled that she could not afford food when she was a freshman student because of textbook costs; this was a common situation among her peers. As the Vice Chair of the UC Student Association's A Campaign for Quality in Resources and Education (ACQUIRE), Ms. Coryea urged the University to set goals for reducing non-tuition costs. She expressed appreciation for UC's existing efforts to reduce these costs, but there was more work to be done.

## 2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

Upon motion duly made and seconded, the minutes of the meetings of May 14 and July 16, 2025 were approved, Regents Anguiano, Batchlor, Cohen, Elliott, Komoto, Makarechian, Milliken, Myers, Reilly, Sarris, Sures, and Wang voting "aye."<sup>1</sup>

---

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

**3. REMARKS OF THE CHAIR OF THE BOARD**

Chair Reilly noted the beginning of the academic year and wished students a successful and fulfilling year ahead. Students were the heart and the purpose of the institution, and the University celebrated their presence, promise, and pursuit of knowledge. The incoming class had a record number of California students and over 28,000 community college transfer students; 54 percent of the class were women. The University continued to be a transformational institution, propelling students' lives, opening doors to economic prosperity, driving social change, and creating pathways to a better future for individuals, families, and communities across the state.

Chair Reilly welcomed President Milliken to UC and emphasized the pace and complexity of issues he has already faced. She welcomed Faculty Representative Susannah Scott, the new Vice Chair of the Academic Senate. Ms. Scott was a long-time faculty member with joint appointments at the Departments of Chemical Engineering and Chemistry and Biochemistry at UC Santa Barbara, where she was also Chair of the campus' Division of the Academic Senate from 2020 to 2024. Chair Reilly welcomed Chancellor Assanis to his first Board meeting; the Board looked forward to his tenure at UCSB. Chair Reilly also noted the recent passing of Regent Emeritus William Bagley, who served on the Board from 1989 to 2002, represented Marin County in the California State Assembly, and was named UC Berkeley Alumnus of the Year in 2002. She expressed gratitude for his many contributions to California and especially to the University.

Chair Reilly concluded by thanking fellow members for their continued involvement on the Board. The Regents had a fiduciary responsibility to care for this institution. While the Board navigates an increasingly complex higher education landscape, its approach was measured, collaborative, and it focused on protecting faculty, students, and staff. Chair Reilly acknowledged President Milliken's partnership and leadership during several intense weeks of close collaboration. The work was serious and demanding, and the University remained unified in its shared commitment to ensuring that UC continues to lead, serve, and excel.

**4. REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNIVERSITY**

President Milliken began his remarks by recognizing and thanking those who helped make this the greatest university system the world has ever known: faculty, on whom the quality, achievements, and reputation of the University depend; students, who benefit from that quality and build on it; talented and dedicated staff who keep the institution moving every day; the Board, a group of dedicated leaders who work long hours to serve the University and the state; donors who invest in people and programs; Governor Newsom and other elected leaders who recognize and support UC as the crown jewel of the state, the nation, and the world; and chancellors and the Office of the President. President Milliken was honored to join them, who with their predecessors built an extraordinary university that transforms lives. UC's commitment to access and success made it a powerful engine of social and economic mobility. As the largest research enterprise in the world, the University improved health, saved lives, drove innovation, supported national defense, and

more, but the University that the world has come to know was now at risk. For years, public confidence in higher education was sinking due in part to perceptions about cost, value, connection to career, and political and cultural indoctrination. One might not agree with the critics, but it was unwise to ignore them. Acknowledging that UC could and should do better does not justify the conclusion that great institutions should be decimated. Taking action against UCLA's research funding did nothing to resolve challenges, but rather it cast a dark shadow over the future and called into question viability of institutions and threatened the future of the state and nation.

President Milliken joined Chair Reilly in addressing the role of the university as the rightful and historical home of debate, controversy, and free speech. Colleges and universities were accused of not valuing freedom of expression guaranteed at public institutions by the First Amendment. UC must leave no doubt that every campus, department, and classroom must be a place where ideas can be expressed openly and without fear, favor, or threats of violence. This is a basic precept of a liberal democracy and a pillar of public higher education. President Milliken reiterated the remarks he made on the day that Charles James "Charlie" Kirk (1993–2025) was killed at Utah Valley University: "Charlie Kirk's murder was tragic and reprehensible. Political violence has no place in our society or on our campuses. This wasn't just an attack on an individual; it was an attack on the very freedoms we as a nation hold dear. This is a very sad day." Two fundamental principles were violated that day. First was ensuring that campus communities are free from violence and safe for students, faculty, staff, patients, and visitors. Everyone on campus must be physically safe. Second was an academic institution's obligation to the unfettered pursuit of truth and the ability to develop, test, and argue for one's own ideas. Regardless of one's political views or belief in whether another is right or wrong, one cannot in civil society use physical violence against another with whom one disagrees. This is the foundation upon which great societies and great universities are built. The University might not be able to satisfy all critics on all matters, but President Milliken and the chancellors pledged to the Regents and the people of California that they would do everything in their power to keep UC campus communities safe and to ensure that campuses are places where constitutional rights of assembly, belief, and expression are cherished and protected. They had no greater or more solemn obligation. Democracy and one's way of life depended on it.

## 5. **REMARKS OF THE CHAIR OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE**

Faculty Representative Palazoglu began his remarks by acknowledging past Faculty Representative Cheung for his service and mentorship. He and Faculty Representative Scott welcomed Chancellor Assanis to his first Board meeting. Mr. Palazoglu remarked on the linear trajectory of his career. Sometime after joining UC Davis in July 1984, he was called upon to serve as department chair, chair of campus and systemwide Academic Senate committees, Vice Chair of the UC Davis Division of the Academic Senate, and now the ultimate responsibility, representing and advocating on behalf of over 14,000 faculty members from ten campuses, which he accepted with humility, enthusiasm, and an understanding and recognition of present challenges. Anxiety was rising due to internal tensions and external pressures, and transparency and open communications were essential to keep the UC community intact.

Quoting renowned American writer and civil rights activist James Baldwin (1924–1987), Mr. Palazoglu stated, “Not everything that is faced can be changed, but nothing can be changed until it is faced.” He noted changes in leadership with the arrival of President Milliken and Chancellors Hu and Assanis, which complemented the annual transition of the systemwide Academic Senate leadership. Change is good; it brings new perspectives and energy and starts new conversations about what may be possible in the future. The University was an engine of change; its research saved lives, improved the food supply, enriched what was consumed, and helped communities thrive. Air and water were cleaner, and farms were more productive and sustainable.

Change is good when lives are changed for the better. Faculty were agents of change. They educated and trained students to become productive members of the community and contributed to the well-being of the state, the nation, and the world. Faculty equipped students with skills and knowledge that would serve them for a lifetime, and students became problem solvers and lifelong learners.

Change is good for personal growth, for seizing opportunities, and for overcoming barriers. The winds of change have been upon UC for some time: an increase in false narratives about the value of a college education, costs outpacing revenues, students struggling with housing and food security, and overworked staff and faculty. The University was now sailing into a hurricane with no land in sight, or not the same land as before.

Change happens when it is least expected or convenient; change can test the resilience of community. The COVID-19 pandemic cost lives and devastated families, but the tests that UC developed saved lives, teleconference meetings became part of the workday reality, and remote teaching showed the possibilities of online education.

Change becomes a necessity when the status quo is unacceptable and conducting business as usual is unsustainable. The disruptions that the University has faced and will likely face demonstrated the need for adaptability. In response, the Academic Senate mounted its Task Force on UC Adaptation to Disruptions (UCAD), whose interim report was issued in July and presented to President Milliken and Academic Senate and UC administrative leaders. It offered a potential roadmap for imagining the future of UC, a promising platform on which the Senate and the administration could engage and act together.

Change will happen when the community reaches a precipice and there is no alternative but to embrace change. The University would drive change collectively, collaboratively, purposefully as it has done in the past and could do again.

Change is good when it invigorates UC to meet its responsibilities to the State of California and pushes UC to deliver on its mission. Mr. Palazoglu trusted the people and processes at UC, noting the collective wisdom of UC faculty, the tenacity of students, and the dedication of staff. In spite of dark clouds obscuring the path forward, he chose to believe that UC could stay true to a path that prioritizes quality and champions access and affordability.

As changes ensue, the Academic Senate reaffirmed its commitment to shared governance and partnership with President Milliken and the Board to sustain the University’s tripartite

mission. UC's strength and impact rested on "the power of ten" world-class campuses working together in pursuit of excellence and defending academic freedom. Mr. Palazoglu emphasized an equally important "power of three": the Academic Senate, the administration, and the Regents, working together through shared governance to uphold UC's academic mission, respond to new challenges, and advance the promise of higher education for future generations. He concluded with a quote from "Kafka on the Shore," a 2002 novel by Japanese author Haruki Murakami: "When you come out of the storm, you won't be the same person who walked in. That's what this storm's all about."

## **6. UC INSPIRES: STUDENT-RUN CHARITIES—UC'S COMMITMENT TO ACADEMIC EXCELLENCE AND SERVICE TO OTHERS**

[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.]

Chair Reilly stated that, given the University's mission of teaching, research, and public service, its broader charge was to cultivate qualities that define leadership: empathy, compassion, and a sense of responsibility for others. She recalled that, as an undergraduate student at UCLA, she was proud to be part of a university rooted in public service. This has inspired students across UC to give back to society at large. Charities founded or led by students exemplified the best of the University, helped students discover their gifts, and taught them the importance of sharing those gifts. These organizations represented hundreds of service-based organizations that were central to the UC experience.

Chancellor Lyons introduced Ella Morrison, a UC Berkeley undergraduate student pursuing Ethnic Studies and Film and Media. She was an organizer for the Teach in Prison (TIP) program, which offered tutoring at San Quentin Rehabilitation Center (San Quentin). Ms. Morrison organized TIP meetings, managed administrative needs, and provided support to over 30 UCB student volunteers at San Quentin. She served as a tutor at Bay Area juvenile detention centers through Incarceration to College and was an American Cultures Engaged Scholarship (ACES) Public Fellow.

Ms. Morrison stated that Teach in Prison, a student-run abolitionist initiative, connected UCB students with incarcerated students at San Quentin. TIP, which originated in 2000 as a student-led Democratic Education at Cal (DeCal) course, was relaunched in 2022 after the COVID-19 pandemic halted in-person programs. Its mission was to expand access to education in carceral settings, foster mutual learning, and challenge the narrative regarding incarceration. Each week, UC Berkeley students partnered with San Quentin education staff to support students' development of reading, writing, and mathematics skills in adult basic education and general educational development classrooms. Students also attended an on-campus class to debrief, heal, and hear from activists and scholars on issues related to the carceral system. Ms. Morrison joined TIP as a freshman student seeking anti-carceral work and was now responsible for the program's relationship with San Quentin and its administrative and educational needs. TIP offered incarcerated students educational skills, hope, and the humanizing experience of being seen for their potential rather than their past. Studies have shown that completing a degree while incarcerated reduced recidivism by

nearly 50 percent, with some education programs resulting in recidivism rates as low as one to two percent. TIP helped UCB students grow, fostered their empathy, enhanced critical thinking, and inspired a lifelong commitment to social change. Ms. Morrison and other students sought to dismantle the carceral system, which in her view isolated people and kept them from community support and love. She expressed deep gratitude to TIP for amplifying carceral perspectives and promoting solidarity.

Chancellor May introduced Walid Jailani, a UC Davis undergraduate student majoring in Neuroscience, Physiology, and Behavior. His experience as an immigrant and former English as a Second Language (ESL) student led him to found the School of Freedom, whose mission was to ensure that no student is denied access to learning because of gender, language, or circumstance. What began as a remote teaching program for girls in Afghanistan was now an official UC Davis student club and a nonprofit organization. School of Freedom provided tutoring, mentorship, and leadership training to underserved students in the U.S. and Afghanistan. Mr. Jailani exemplified the compassionate, globally minded leadership that UC Davis sought to achieve.

Mr. Jailani recalled that in 2021, his first year at UC Davis, the Taliban had taken over Afghanistan and banned girls from attending school. He and his friends decided to do something about this and began to offer online English classes to Afghan girls. After one week, more than 300 students signed up to help, and the program's capacity grew from teaching 30 students to 150 students in its first year. Noting the high demand for the program and the resources that these girls needed, School of Freedom applied to be a Registered Student Organization and recruited more UCD students and even teachers who had lost their jobs in Afghanistan. School of Freedom was then able to provide the girls a full curriculum with mathematics, science, and English, as well a sense of hope and belonging. The program demonstrated that a community in the West continued to remember and support them. School of Freedom sought to remove barriers to education by providing accessible, supportive, and culturally responsive learning opportunities and to nurture students to become future leaders. More than 1,200 students now attended classes online. School of Freedom has also partnered with the Elk Grove Unified School District and had future plans to provide K–12 students with assistance with homework and college applications. The program paired high school students with mentors who were UCD students and alumni or students from other colleges. Founding School of Freedom created many opportunities for Mr. Jailani, including this presentation to the Regents. It gave him a voice to advocate on behalf of others, built many meaningful relationships, and showed him that one could create lasting change even while pursuing a degree. Each person could play a role in doing the right thing. Mr. Jailani was also pursuing a minor in Education due to his passion for teaching. School of Freedom held the belief that education is freedom and that every student, regardless of where they are from or what language they speak, deserves a chance to learn and thrive.

Chancellor Gillman introduced Chloe Selby, who recently graduated from UC Irvine with a B.S. in Earth System Science and a B.A. in Environmental Science and Policy. Ms. Selby was a leader of the UCI chapter of Food Recovery Network.

Ms. Selby stated that the UCI chapter of Food Recovery Network, part of the largest student movement against food waste and hunger in the country, engaged in volunteering, educational outreach, and community building. According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture, in 2023, 47.4 million people lived in food insecure households while millions of pounds of food were wasted. Food Recovery Network offered both on- and off-campus volunteer opportunities. In spring 2024, the Move Out Donation Drive engaged 6,530 students and collected 2,467 pounds of food from student housing. This event contributed to UCI's sustainability initiatives and was featured in the Campus Race to Zero Waste competition. Off campus, volunteers averaged 200 pounds of food recovered per week from farmer's markets to donate to the food pantry Mary's Kitchen. Food Recovery Network also hosted holiday food donation drives and convention center food recovery in partnership with organizations like Second Harvest Food Bank of Orange County and Food Finders. This academic year, volunteers recovered 9,159 pounds of food. Food Network Recovery engaged in educational outreach such as tabling events, a sustainable movie night, and teaching Orange County high school students about food waste. The program bolstered the campus community with free events such as Grocery Bingo and cooking classes. Ms. Selby invited Regents to volunteer with Food Recovery Network.

Chancellor Muñoz introduced Anthony "A.J." Heard, a UC Merced undergraduate student majoring in Civil Engineering and the founding President of Bobcat Community Builders (BCB). He was a member of the National Science Foundation Innovation Corps, UC Advocacy Network, and the Civil Engineering Student Association. He received the Distinguished Leadership Award from the Margo F. Souza Student Leadership Center and the Distinguished Volunteer Scholarship from the University Friends Circle. Mr. Heard has studied in Singapore and South Africa and worked in Guatemala and Ethiopia. He launched one limited liability company in media production and one in food sustainability.

Mr. Heard stated that BCB mobilized nearly 900 students, many of whom had never engaged in organized service before, to volunteer at homeless shelters, clothing drives, citywide cleanups, community engagement events, and more. Beyond Merced, BCB helped clean national parks, sent Christmas gifts to children in developing nations, and sent members on mission trips to Guatemala. Mr. Heard and fellow UCM student Fasha Lennon, founder of Beyond Merced, traveled to Ethiopia to build wells. He recalled what President Drake had said to him in a meeting, which paraphrased a quote from American tennis player Arthur Ashe (1943–1993): "We start where we are, use what we have, and do what we can."

Chancellor Hu introduced Eliana Arroyo, a UC Riverside student and event coordinator for Project Sunshine in 2024–25. With a major in Neuroscience and a minor in Education, Ms. Arroyo had a passion for supporting childhood well-being and has conducted research on autism and served as the marketing director of Latino Medical Student Association PLUS.

Ms. Arroyo, a first-generation Latina college student, stated that she joined Project Sunshine as a freshman student and was now the incoming Co-President. Her visits to the pediatric ward at Kaiser Fontana Medical Center had an impact on the physician she one day wished to be. She recalled visiting a six-year-old hospice patient and a three-year old

patient. Project Sunshine helped patients to be children again and provided breaks for both patients and their parents. Through the power of play, Project Sunshine created opportunities for patients to be people outside of their illnesses. In another visit, Ms. Arroyo met a patient who was excited to be discharged and begin college. The UCR chapter of Project Sunshine encouraged volunteers to foster a sense of connection, with many volunteers planning to pursue pediatrics in the long term. The chapter organized biweekly hospital visits, and volunteers packed over 2,500 craft kits every year.

Staff Advisor Frías asked the presenters about their sources of inspiration. Mr. Heard replied that he was inspired by those in his life who go beyond themselves to assist others. Mr. Jailani replied that he was inspired by his early experiences as well as his parents and their sacrifices for him and their care for the community. Ms. Selby replied that she was inspired by her parents, who always pushed her to try. Ms. Arroyo acknowledged her faith and the care and support of her community. She was a proud Latina from the Inland Empire, and her culture emphasized care and connection. Ms. Morrison replied that she was motivated, inspired, and supported by her community, as this work did not happen in isolation. She stated that she and her peers stood on the shoulders of the giants who came before them and laid the foundation for them to engage in this work.

Regent Sarris expressed pride in the presenters, who were carrying out the UC mission even as students. Addressing Ms. Morrison, he contrasted his past as a truant in a juvenile detention center who did not read a book until the 11th grade with now being a UC alumnus, former UC English professor, and a Regent. TIP enabled students to feel seen and heard, which made a significant difference.

## 7. **REMARKS FROM STUDENT ASSOCIATIONS**

President Milliken introduced UC Student Association (UCSA) President Aditi Hariharan.

Ms. Hariharan began her remarks by noting the federal government's overreach into higher education, especially the \$500 million reduction in federal funding for UCLA. She stated that the best way to fight the Trump administration's attacks on higher education is to protect the University's values, such as its commitment to access and affordability. She observed that UC acquiescence to the federal government's demands by removing diversity statements from UC hiring processes and infringing upon the rights of student governments did not spare the University from threats of funding cuts. She believed that, if UC were to comply with federal demands like Brown University and Columbia University, the federal government would make more demands and intensify attacks on students, staff, faculty, and the entire higher education ecosystem. Students of color; queer, transgender, immigrant, and disabled students; and UC laborers would suffer further. Despite its precarious position, the University was also uniquely positioned to bolster protection of its students, staff, and faculty. UC should be augmenting its commitment to supporting students, not making cuts to diversity, equity, and inclusion programs, initiatives, and staffing. For example, all the recruitment and retention project directors from student-initiated programs at UCLA were terminated. This work now fell to students, and program capacity has been significantly reduced, robbing students of the support for which they

advocated. At UC Riverside, there were reports of identity-centered specializations being removed from staff titles, and at UC Santa Cruz, student organizations of color were forced to edit their club descriptions.

The University was already struggling with recruiting and retaining a diverse student body. According to the 2021 UC Accountability Report, enrollment rates for African American and American Indian undergraduate students were low compared with admission rates, and a gap persisted between the graduation rates of undergraduate students from underrepresented racial groups and white and Asian undergraduate students. Ms. Hariharan stated that students perceived that UC would not care for them as support staff positions were eliminated and felt strongly that the University was becoming more uninhabitable. At her own campus, the Middle Eastern, North African and South Asian (MENASA) Center helped Ms. Hariharan feel a sense of belonging, and student organizations such as Students for Reproductive Freedom hosted events that allowed students to engage in discussions about structural inequity. She underscored that UC must continue to fund recruitment and retention and must not comply with the demands of the Trump administration. According to pay gap reporting from Institutional Research and Academic Planning at the Office of the President (UCOP), students from historically disenfranchised communities tended to leave the University with higher debt and lower pay, which made life after graduation more difficult. Although UC could not control employment opportunities, it could offer specialized career and workforce readiness support. Ms. Hariharan looked forward to continuing this conversation with UCOP. In her view, those most affected by federal funding changes deserved to be part of the decision-making process, but neither she, UC Graduate and Professional Council (UCGPC) President Stephanie Valadez, nor UCLA's elected student representatives have been consulted regarding UCLA's negotiations with the federal government. Ms. Hariharan understood that these negotiations were confidential but stressed that the UC administration should find a way to consult students.

There were many other ongoing issues at UC campuses that needed to be addressed. The most recent State audit released in April 2025 highlighted UC's non-compliance with the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) and Cal NAGPRA. The audit noted campuses' lack of fully developed repatriation plans led to inconsistent funding, and the lack of systemwide repatriation goals and meaningful consultation with tribes, particularly non-federally recognized tribes. Ms. Hariharan expressed gratitude to Regent Sarris for agreeing to add NAGPRA compliance to the agenda of a future Regents meeting to discuss how UC would take steps toward respecting and returning Native remains and cultural items. The proposed changes to the cohort tuition model would leave 46 percent of students, including nearly 30 percent of students who had a family income of less than \$120,000 with increased financial burden. Tuition today was 19 percent higher than it was four years ago and almost three times higher than in the decade prior. Ms. Hariharan regarded the model as a forever tuition increase that did not charge a progressive fee, but rather just a fee. She strongly urged the Board not to approve the proposed changes to the tuition cohort model. If the Regents did approve the changes, she asked that they keep return to aid at 45 percent and reject the additional financial burden on students. Ms. Hariharan looked forward to continuing these conversations with Regents.

President Milliken introduced UCGPC President Stephanie Valadez.

Ms. Valadez began her remarks by acknowledging that this meeting was being held on the traditional and unceded land of the Ramaytush Ohlone people. The knowledge, traditions, and ways of indigenous peoples have resisted and defied the capitalist, colonial ways of this country. Attending a Regents meeting was a privilege but also imparted a sense of responsibility. Ms. Valadez was proud to be a student at the University; her colleagues were shaping the future through research and innovation, work that kept California at the forefront of progress. She recalled that her father, a UC Davis alumnus, had taken her to Picnic Day when she was a little girl. Having studied at a California State University campus, a community college, a private university, and a conservatory before attending UC, Ms. Valadez never witnessed more distrust between students and the administration than she witnessed at UC. The University system should be a model of unity, collaborative and productive growth, and shared purpose. With 299,000 students, 266,000 faculty and staff, and 2.5 million alumni, UC had the capacity to stand up to federal overreach. She asked why the University was divided.

Students did not fault UC for global crises or federal policies but did hold the University accountable for decisions within UC's authority: housing, affordability, and student well-being. She was heartened to see changes made to eligibility rules for UC Santa Cruz Family Student Housing and appreciated being heard after calling attention to an oversight and suggesting a solution. Students and the administration might not always agree but could leverage expertise, collaborate, and find better solutions together. Students were afraid and struggling, but the administration has been silent. Basic needs such as food, housing, childcare, and health care were becoming more unaffordable. The dream of college as a pathway toward security, opportunity, and growth was under threat, as were a sense of belonging and the perception of the value of a college education. The basic structures of academia, scholarship, research, and education were no longer guaranteed.

On August 9, representatives of UCGPC, UCSA, and campus student government sent a letter pleading with the administration to stand united against authoritarianism. Eight days later, they received a dismissive response that did not address student concerns. Meetings between President Milliken and the UCSA and UCGPC presidents were reduced from 45 to 30 minutes, and quarterly meetings with campus representatives were shortened from one hour to 45 minutes. The hybrid meeting option was removed, which limited accessibility and transparency. Meanwhile, UC faced significant legal challenges that demonstrated a lack of institutional response to the concerns of students, faculty, and staff. Trust in the administration was shattered when UC Berkeley provided names of students and faculty to the U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights (OCR), names that UC did not need to disclose. An OCR investigation determined whether UC complied with Title VI, and personal information was irrelevant. Ms. Valadez asked how students could trust the University to protect them, noting that a recent federal court ruling allowed profiling based on language and skin color. The Student Advocate to the Regents application asked students if their preferred language was English or Spanish. Ms. Valadez asked if her name would be provided to the federal government because she is a Spanish speaker or if her children in UC daycare would be given up if she speaks to them in their native language.

She urged the University to partner with those already taking action. The prior day, September 16, a coalition of unions, faculty, students, and advocacy organizations filed suit against the Trump administration. UC had an opportunity to stand on the right side of history. Ms. Valadez concluded by quoting U.S. Supreme Court Justice Robert H. Jackson (1892–1954) when he served as a prosecutor in the Nuremberg Trials: “The wrongs which we seek to condemn and punish have been so calculated, so malignant, and so devastating, that civilization cannot tolerate their being ignored, because it cannot survive their being repeated.” What Justice Jackson had warned of was now happening. Students were calling out, and UC leaders would be remembered for their action or inaction.

The Board recessed at 10:20 a.m.

.....

The Board reconvened at 2:45 p.m. with Chair Reilly presiding.

Members present: Regents Anguiano, Batchlor, Brooks, Cohen, Komoto, Kounalakis, Leib, Makarechian, Milliken, Park, Reilly, Sarris, and Wang

In attendance: Regents-designate Craven, Melton, and Tokita, Faculty Representatives Palazoglu and Scott, Secretary and Chief of Staff Lyall, General Counsel Robinson, Chief Compliance and Audit Officer Bustamante, Provost Newman, Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer Brostrom, Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer Nava, Executive Vice President Rubin, Vice Presidents Brown, Kao, Maldonado, and Williams, Chancellors Assanis, Frenk, Gillman, Hawgood, Khosla, Larive, Lyons, May, and Muñoz, and Recording Secretary Li

## 8. UC AI OVERVIEW

[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.]

Chair Reilly introduced the item. Artificial intelligence (AI) was a technological revolution and a historical inflection point, reshaping how one lives, works, learns, and governs. The University had a responsibility to help guide California through this AI transition, preparing the work force and ensuring equitable access to tools, research, and partnerships. She underscored that this was not only a moment of opportunity but also one of obligation. The University could take a bold, intentional, and unified approach and shape the public conversation regarding AI for the benefit of students, faculty, and society.

President Milliken recalled that the Presidential search committee had asked him what he thought were the two most important issues. He replied that they were threats to the research enterprise and AI. The two existed at the same time. He projected that AI would transform teaching, research, health care, and work. UC needed to be at the forefront of the ethical development and deployment of AI, having had a long history of success in this field since the 1960s. The work now being done at UC campuses was incredible. This presentation would be part of a continuing discussion.

Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer Nava stated that the University's AI strategy was the product of extensive consultation with experts and industry leaders.

Vice President and Chief Information Officer Williams stated that AI was already in daily use at UC campuses and health systems, and the State has also identified UC's AI leadership as a priority. The University's vision was to be world's higher education leader in AI and UC was uniquely positioned to leverage AI to advance social well-being and the health of the people of California and beyond. This vision would have four outcomes: improved student success and access, increased research speed and impact, better clinical quality and efficiency, and a California workforce prepared for an AI-driven economy. The vision also rested on three pillars: scaling innovation, fostering strategic partnerships, and preparing California's workforce. The work to deliver trustworthy AI tools to UC's constituents has resulted in hundreds of research papers and classroom pilot programs, several large-scale AI events, and the development of a strong UC AI community of practice. UC sought to scale this impact by sharing best practices, developing systemwide use cases, and identifying shared needs. Numerous opportunities to scale AI efforts included new course development, the acceleration of invention and discovery, and ambient clinical documentation. Scaling proven tools lowered cost for campuses, raised quality, and provided consistent guardrails for managing risk. UC recognized that success required partnerships and was the first California university system to partner with OpenAI in June 2024, made OpenAI available to researchers through an agreement with Microsoft, and made trustworthy AI tools and services from Google, Adobe, and Salesforce available to staff, students, and faculty. UC was working with the State to identify opportunities for further partnerships, which led to a deeper relationship with companies like NVIDIA. UC's AI strategy supported workforce development by building awareness, skills, and collaboration. UC has coordinated events like the AI Congress and the AI Administrative Conference; supported webinars, meetings, and community of practice events across the system; and supported pedagogical use cases at the campuses. UC was also training Californians through the Degree Plus initiative. Three opportunities could transform AI's impact on the system. First, systemwide support for computational data and AI infrastructure required cross-campus collaboration and public-private partnership. Second, AI research and innovation hubs could streamline and provide a central home for cross-campus collaborations. Third was a composable learning stack. AI would have a profound impact on teaching, and fast, large-scale sharing would be needed to broaden systemwide and societal impact. UC already had a strong foundation. With clear priorities, strong governance, and focused investments, UC could move from scattered pilot programs and proofs of concept to durable, meaningful services that result in transformative experiences for students and patients, groundbreaking tools for researchers and staff, and stronger outcomes for an AI-ready California population.

Provost Newman stated that the two-day, systemwide AI Congress at UCLA in February 2024 convened administrators, faculty leaders, scholars, and speakers to discuss the impact of AI on labor markets and the economy, role of UC, AI policy, and data privacy. The lead speaker, Daron Acemoglu, would go on to win the Nobel Prize two months later. UC needed to prepare faculty to teach students to use AI creatively and responsibly, and UC needed to prepare students to consider and use these tools as they enter the workforce.

According to the 2024 UC Undergraduate Experience Survey, 65 percent of respondents already used AI to brainstorm writing projects and presentations, conduct research, and study for exams. AI use was most prevalent among students in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) disciplines, especially engineering and computer science. These trends were expected to grow as technology improves and as other disciplines identify applications for these tools. Earlier this year, Ms. Newman's office partnered with UC San Diego's Tritonlytics to survey faculty regarding their practices and their opinions about AI tools. Nearly 70 percent of respondents agreed or strongly agreed with the statement "AI-powered tools and technologies will play a critical role in the future of my field." A majority of faculty indicated that they were using or intended to use AI tools for research methods and data analysis, teaching, and student engagement. This survey could serve as a foundation as UC continues to monitor faculty activities and sentiments. Ms. Newman shared examples of how UC faculty and academic programs were leading the way. The UC Berkeley School of Law has launched a new Master of Laws program with certificates of specialization in AI law and regulation, the first of its kind. The program was designed in consultation with industry leaders and would help students develop skills in areas such as data privacy, intellectual property (IP), licensing, and risk. UC Santa Cruz launched the AI Art Augmentation and Acceleration (A4) Lab in 2024. The state-of-the-art multimedia lab was the product of a partnership between UCSC and Advanced Micro Devices (AMD) and provided hands-on experience with AI computing tools that were rapidly being adopted in the gaming design and entertainment industries.

Chancellor Hawgood stated that UCSF has been working to develop an AI strategy since fall 2023. Unlike the other nine campuses, UCSF did not have an engineering or computer science school and took a more translational and applied approach to AI. Chancellor Hawgood chaired an AI leadership group that convened the campus' five workstreams in health care, research, education, back-office administration, and infrastructure every six weeks. UCSF was trying to build enterprise-wide solutions for the health care, back-office administration, and infrastructure workstreams and supported multiple pilot programs from the research and education workstreams. The campus also entered into multiple commercial partnerships; OpenAI had office space near the campus. Clean, curated data were central to all AI work, and over the last few years, UCSF has been building data foundation across all data streams known as the Scuba Enterprise Data Warehouse Framework. The raw data collected from 106 systems helped UCSF improve reporting and analytics, and Scuba could now be applied to generative and agentic AI tools. AI innovation at the campus began with basic tools on Epic, an electronic health record system, in 2017. In 2019, UCSF established a formal AI oversight and governance structure with the deployment of clinical AI. This ensured that the campus utilized equitable and trustworthy AI in the clinical setting. In 2023, UCSF introduced Versa, a platform built using the Office of the President's (UCOP's) contract with OpenAI and Microsoft that enabled the deployment of large language models using data that would not leave UCSF. In 2024, UCSF introduced its Impact Monitoring Platform for AI in Clinical Care (IMPACC), program that the campus would continually evaluate for safety, efficiency, and equity. The pilot programs supported by UCSF, which ranged from DNA sequencing to population models, were connected to knowledge models that promote AI-driven learning. For example, AI-Driven Genomics at Scale, a collaboration between UCSF, UC Berkley,

and UCLA funded by the UC National Laboratories Fees Research Program, would allow UC to sequence, understand protein function, and develop therapeutics. Chancellor Hawgood asked Versa about recent publications about AI from UCSF and found that the campus contributed significantly to the field of AI. In 2021 and with the help of a donor, UCSF launched a graduate program in Computational Precision Health, a new discipline at the intersection of AI, statistics, medicine, and population health, and recruited faculty with joint appointments at the San Francisco and the Berkeley campuses. The idea for this discipline came from a meeting in 2019 of the boards of the UCSF and UC Berkeley Foundations.

Jennifer Chayes, Dean of the College of Computing, Data Science, and Society (CDSS) at UC Berkeley, stated that UC had a crucial role to play in AI research and innovation in close partnership with industry and as part of the start-up ecosystem. She shared examples of research at CDSS. Berkeley AI Research (BAIR) and Sky Computing Lab, which have given rise to many start-up companies, and the recently published “Startup Campus” detailed the research and start-up culture on campus. UCB faculty and students have long contributed to cutting-edge research, founding new companies and making technological advancements from which new industries sprang. Professor David Patterson’s recent op-ed in *The Hill* advocating for federal investment in innovation highlighted a 10,000-to-one return on investment. Discoveries that made possible smartphones and mobile devices came from UC Berkeley computer science laboratories. Research on AI systems was focused on open-source technologies, which could be shared throughout the world. Professors Anca Dragan and Raluca Ada Popa were both on leave from UC Berkeley, leading AI safety and security efforts at Google. Students Anastasios Angelopoulos and Wei-Lin Chiang and DataBricks co-founder and UCB Professor Ion Stoica co-founded LMArena, which recently received \$100 million in venture capital funding and had a \$600 million valuation. LMArena was the most widely used benchmarking platform in AI; 150 million prompts compared over 700 models. The intersection of AI research and other disciplines has led to significant impacts on health, climate change, and other areas. The Computational Precision Health discipline was developing the new field of AI and medical technology. Assistant Professor Adam Yala was creating algorithms that would better predict cancer risk and improve the early detection of breast cancer. Professor Omar Yaghi and his collaborators used AI to accelerate by a factor of 100 the creation of materials that could capture carbon dioxide from the air. CDSS was collaborating with journalists, lawyers, and civil liberty organizations to develop public databases using AI. The Police Records Access Project, led by Associate Professor Aditya Parameswaran, was a first-of-its-kind resource in collaboration with four major media outlets in California. AI was already interacting with society, and leadership from public institutions and further collaboration were needed to inform policy and engage with future challenges and opportunities. Last year, CDSS partnered with Governor Newsom, State agencies, and others to hold a summit to explore how Generative AI could better serve Californians. The Governor’s Joint California Policy Working Group on AI Frontier Models, co-led by Ms. Chayes, released a report incorporating expertise from academia and industry and input from the population. The report has been cited by State legislators, government agencies, industry, and civil society organizations.

Regent Makarechian referred to articles written about AI start-up companies that were breaking into systems, abusing and misusing data, and about privacy issues. He asked about the risk associated with sharing data. Mr. Williams replied that UC has shared data among its academic medical centers for a number of years. His team worked with UC Health to secure what were regarded as UC's highest-priority data. Vulnerability assessments were run regularly, most recently by an outside firm, which confirmed no findings and no recommendations. He and others at UC believed that the value of sharing these data far outweighed the risk. In one example cited by the late UC Health Chief Data Scientist Atul Butte (1969–2025), UC was able to reduce costs associated with administering medications by sharing data among medical centers.

Regent Makarechian clarified that he was concerned about identifying information. Chancellor Hawgood replied that great effort was made to de-identify the data in the UC Health Data Warehouse, and an outside firm was retained to certify this. Another series of precautions were taken when accessing the real-time electronic health record. The systemwide data sharing agreement from over five years ago would need to be updated. UC was very conservative about sharing data outside the UC system.

Regent Makarechian asked if UC was benefiting financially from sharing these data. Chancellor Hawgood responded that the financial benefit came from operating a safer, higher-quality, and more efficient health system. UC has been approached by many entities to sell the data, but to his knowledge, UC has not broached the subject yet. Chancellor Hawgood shared his view that the conversation needed to be revisited.

Regent Makarechian stated his understanding that OpenAI paid *The New York Times* and *The Wall Street Journal* for their articles and asked why UC could not benefit similarly. Ms. Chayes clarified that OpenAI was not paying *The New York Times* or other sources. Professor Pamela Samuelson of the UC Berkeley School of Law, a leading authority on AI and IP, was helping UC navigate some of these questions. Ms. Chayes agreed with Mr. Williams that improving the quality of health care would lead to more money for the UC system. A donor gave UC \$10 million to build an open source platform for systems like Epic and Cerner that would allow machine learning using patient data, eventually making suggestions to doctors and patients. The platform was one year from deployment, and the pilot program focused on continuous glucose monitors. Venture capital investors expressed interest in the ability to build a proprietary layer over the open source platform. The University would be the first to take advantage of this.

Regent Makarechian noted that, last year, OpenAI paid \$250 million to publications including News Corp to publish articles.

Regent Cohen asked how UCOP would add value when every campus had its own innovation and partnerships. Ms. Newman replied that systemwide events like the AI Congress convened people from all UC campuses to discover the most productive collaborations. A proposal for the sort of systemwide hub that Mr. Williams mentioned was warmly received by the State, which did not currently have the resources to invest in the endeavor. The University envisioned a systemwide infrastructure for the future. At

present, this took the form of collaborations between principal investigators and convening individuals across the system to identify best practices. Ms. Nava added that, from an operations perspective, questions about infrastructure and computing power offered a major opportunity. UCOP and the system had a chance to partner with industry, the State, and elsewhere to seek financial support for infrastructure. Mr. Williams remarked that UC had a huge amount of bargaining power given its size. In its agreement with OpenAI, the University was able to negotiate terms that no one else could, including lower pricing for campuses as well as data and privacy protections. In its systemwide partnership with Amazon, UC had access to large-scale researchers and received \$2 million annually. Companies like Microsoft, Facebook, and Google were investing about \$20 billion per quarter in research infrastructure. No UC campus could achieve this by itself. In order to train doctoral students to solve the problems UC wished to solve, the University must determine how it would fund this effort. Otherwise, UC would risk losing talent to corporate laboratories, would not be able to develop open source tools, and would not be regarded as a thought leader. Ms. Chayes added that, having spent 23 years at Microsoft, she believed UC was doing more for AI research and that State government should help with funding.

Regent Wang recalled that, during her visits to each campus, she learned that they needed help gaining computational power. Individual campuses did not have access to data centers, and the lack of infrastructure was impeding research. She asked about the challenges keeping UC from becoming a larger force in AI. Mr. Williams replied that the challenges were related to funding, scale, and collaboration. UC did not often engage in systemwide fundraising campaigns or enter into public-private partnerships of this scale. The federal government was still a significant source of funding for AI, which was a bipartisan issue. Mr. Williams likened the type of large-scale partnership needed for this effort to the Alliance for Renewable Clean Hydrogen Energy Systems (ARCHES).

Staff Advisor Frías noted that UC had experts on the potential unintended social consequences of the use of AI. Mr. Williams responded that UCLA Professor Safiya Noble, who served on a U.S. President's AI advisory council, has provided much advice. He believed that she would probably take the view that data centralization should be avoided. In response to Regent Makarechian's earlier question about data monetization, Mr. Williams stated that companies like Epic have already centralized data from many medical centers and were providing access to those data. UC was challenged to consider whether it wished to have a third party with very little liability and nearly no indemnification centralize UC data or create partnerships, maximize value captured, and prioritize risk mitigation strategies. He worked with many UC faculty on cybersecurity, privacy, and bias issues. Ms. Newman added that many of the impacts of AI were not yet known, particularly in the labor force. At a future AI Congress, an expert from Stanford University planned to present a new research paper on the impact of AI on job creation and destruction. Ultimately, this was an inexorable technology, so UC should train its students to be leaders in the field and to understand how AI could potentially improve productivity. All technological waves had their complications and displacements. The University's social science and labor market experts were also examining AI.

Staff Advisor Hanson shared that he used generative AI every day and he motivated his staff to do the same. According to an article from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, most AI implementation was not successful at the enterprise level, often due to a lack of training. UC did not have the people or materials to provide much-needed AI training to staff. Mr. Hanson wished to advance a dialogue on training at all salary levels. Citing a discussion from the 2023 World Economic Forum, he stated that AI itself would not take jobs, but individuals trained in AI would. Mr. Hanson wished to share his experience if staff input was sought. Ms. Newman noted a forthcoming UCOP event at which staff would share their experience with AI with their colleagues. The University has offered to help educate State employees using productivity-enhancing tools developed at UC San Diego. In Ms. Newman's view, all employees at all income and skill levels could learn to master this technology so that it becomes a partner instead of an enemy. Mr. Williams added that the Office of the Chief Information Officer and Human Resources were working to partner either with LinkedIn Learning or SkillSoft to provide every employee with access to AI content. UCOP could support campuses by leveraging its relationships. Ms. Chayes added that UC Berkeley was working with UCLA to provide courses at both UC and the California Community Colleges that would teach learners how to mitigate bias and build an AI agent. She emphasized the importance of demonstrating to the State that UC was a leader in educating all segments of public higher education.

Regent Park asked campuses how much they were currently spending on AI versus how much they should be spending and whether it was too hard to quantify. Chancellor Lyons replied that it was too hard to quantify as efforts were decentralized at UC Berkeley. He had been told by Mr. Yaghi that AI could advance interdisciplinary research, enabling him to work with colleagues in other fields. Platform development needed investment.

In Regent Park's view, the University did not seem to have an investment plan, and campuses did not know what investments were needed. Chancellor Gillman replied that UC Irvine invested millions of dollars to create an infrastructure in different domains for faculty, researchers, administration, and staff. Isolated, controlled environments known as "sandboxes" were needed for experimentation. ZotGPT was an AI platform developed as a result. In the coming weeks, UCI planned to announce a massive new investment in transformative teaching. Chancellor Hawgood shared that, about 18 months ago, UCSF found that its facility could no longer provide the electricity and cooling that its high-performance computer cluster needed. Three months ago, UCSF began utilizing a commercial data center to manage its core infrastructure in a "condo model." There was virtually no latency, and UCSF was better able to scale its efforts. Ms. Chayes added that, at the systemwide level, UC was in discussion with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) to locate data centers at its Ames Research Center. Having UC's own data centers across the state would be less expensive than a condo model, and the University would have 100 percent use of them. Chancellor Frenk stated that UCLA established a Chief AI Officer position. AI would be treated as both an instrument for research and a substantive topic of research.

Chair Reilly stated that this was the first comprehensive discussion about AI to come before the Board. There was much interest in and enthusiasm for the topic, and the conversation

would continue at a future meeting. She asked how the Board could be of most assistance from a systemwide perspective.

The Board recessed at 3:45 p.m.

.....

The Board reconvened at 5:00 p.m. with Chair Reilly presiding.

Members present: Regents Anguiano, Batchlor, Brooks, Chu, Cohen, Komoto, Kounalakis, Leib, Makarechian, Milliken, Myers, Reilly, Sarris, and Wang

In attendance: Regents-designate Craven, Melton, and Tokita, Faculty Representatives Palazoglu and Scott, Secretary and Chief of Staff Lyall, General Counsel Robinson, Executive Vice President and Chief Financial Officer Brostrom, Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer Nava, Senior Vice President Turner, Vice President Kao, Chancellors Assanis, Frenk, Hawgood, Hu, Lyons, May, and Muñoz, and Recording Secretary Li

## 9. COMMITTEE REPORTS INCLUDING APPROVAL OF RECOMMENDATIONS FROM COMMITTEES

Chair Reilly stated that Chairs of Committees and Special Committees that met at this meeting and off-cycle would deliver reports on recommended actions and items discussed, providing an opportunity for Regents who did not attend a particular meeting to ask questions.

### Report of the Academic and Student Affairs Committee

The Committee presented the following from its meeting of September 17 2025:

A. *Degree Plus: Enriching Career Preparation for UC Students*

This item was not summarized.

B. *The University of California's Engagement with K-12 in the Inland Empire and the San Joaquin Valley*

This item was not summarized.

### Report of the Compliance and Audit Committee

The Committee presented the following from its meeting of September 17, 2025:

**A. *Consent Item: University of California Compliance with State Assembly Bill 481***

The Committee recommended approval of the UC military equipment use policy in Attachment 1 and the annual report on military equipment inventory in Attachment 2, including requested equipment, to comply with California Assembly Bill 481.

**B. *Appointment of Regents' External Auditor***

The Committee recommended that the Regents approve KPMG as the Regents' external auditor for a five-year term.

Upon motion of Regent Anguiano, duly seconded, the recommendations of the Compliance and Audit Committee were approved, Regents Anguiano, Batchlor, Brooks, Chu, Cohen, Komoto, Kounalakis, Leib, Makarechian, Milliken, Myers, Reilly, Sarris, and Wang voting "aye."

**Report of the Finance and Capital Strategies Committee**

The Committee presented the following from its meeting of September 17, 2025:

**A. *Consent Agenda:*****(1) *Center for Health Sciences Emergency Power Upgrade, Los Angeles Campus: Budget Amendment and External Financing***

The Committee recommended to the Regents that:

- a. The 2025–26 Budget for Capital Improvements and the Capital Improvement Program be amended as follows:

From: Los Angeles: Center for Health Sciences Emergency Power Upgrade – preliminary plans, working drawings, and construction – \$39,795,000 funded by campus funds (\$32,795,000) and one-time State funds allocated for deferred maintenance (\$7 million).

To: Los Angeles: Center for Health Sciences Emergency Power Upgrade – preliminary plans, working drawings, and construction – \$41,795,000 funded by external financing (\$34,795,000) and one-time State funds allocated for deferred maintenance (\$7 million).

- b. The President of the University shall be authorized to approve external financing in an amount not to exceed \$34,795,000, plus additional related financing costs to finance the Center for Health

Sciences Emergency Power Upgrade project. The President shall require that:

- i. As long as the debt is outstanding, the general revenues of the Los Angeles campus shall be maintained in amounts sufficient to pay the debt service and to meet the related requirements of the authorized financing.
- ii. The general credit of the Regents shall not be pledged.

(2) ***2025 Long Range Development Plan, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory: Approval Following Certification of an Environmental Impact Report Pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act***

The Committee recommended that, following review and consideration of the environmental consequences of the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) 2025 Long Range Development Plan (LRDP), as required by the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), including any written information addressing this item received by the Office of the Secretary and Chief of Staff to the Regents no less than 48 hours in advance of the beginning of this Regents meeting, testimony or written materials presented to the Regents during the scheduled public comment period, and the item presentation, the Regents:

- A. Certify the LBNL 2025 LRDP Final Environmental Impact Report.
- B. Make as a condition of approval the implementation of applicable mitigation measures within the responsibility and jurisdiction of LBNL as identified in the 2025 LRDP Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.
- C. Adopt the 2025 LRDP Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.
- D. Adopt the CEQA Findings and Statement of Overriding Considerations for the 2025 LRDP.
- E. Approve the LBNL 2025 LRDP.

B. ***Preliminary Discussion of the University's 2026–27 Operating Budget***

This item was not summarized.

Upon motion of Regent Cohen, duly seconded, the recommendations of the Finance and Capital Strategies Committee were approved, Regents Anguiano, Batchlor, Brooks, Chu,

Cohen, Komoto, Kounalakis, Leib, Makarechian, Milliken, Myers, Reilly, Sarris, and Wang voting “aye.”

### **Report of the Governance Committee**

The Committee presented the following from its meeting of September 17, 2025:

#### ***Approval of Incentive Compensation for Fiscal Year 2024–25 for Jagdeep Singh Bachher as Chief Investment Officer and Senior Vice President – Investments, Office of the President as Discussed in Closed Session***

The Committee recommended approval of a Short Term Incentive award of \$1,975,588 for Plan Year 2024–25, under the Office of the Chief Investment Officer Annual Incentive Plan (AIP), for Jagdeep Singh Bachher as Chief Investment Officer and Senior Vice President – Investments, Office of the President. The recommended incentive award represents 200 percent of the base salary that Mr. Bachher received during the plan year, which was \$987,794.

The incentive compensation described above shall constitute the University’s total commitment regarding incentive compensation until modified by the Regents or the President, as applicable under Regents policy, and shall supersede all previous oral and written commitments. Compensation recommendations and final actions will be released to the public as required in accordance with the standard procedures of the Board of Regents.

Upon motion of Chair Reilly, duly seconded, the recommendation of the Governance Committee was approved, Regents Anguiano, Batchlor, Chu, Cohen, Komoto, Leib, Makarechian, Milliken, Myers, Reilly, and Sarris voting “aye” and Regents Brooks, Kounalakis, and Wang abstaining.

### **Report of the Health Services Committee**

The Committee presented the following from its meeting of September 16, 2025:

#### ***Comments of the Executive Vice President for UC Health***

This item was not summarized.

### **Report of the Special Committee on Nominations**

The Special Committee presented the following from its meeting of September 17, 2025:

#### ***Appointment of Chancellors to Standing Committees***

The Special Committee recommended that:

- A. Chancellor Hu be appointed as an advisory member of the Academic and Student Affairs Committee and the Public Engagement and Development Committee, effective immediately through June 30, 2026.
- B. Chancellor Assanis be appointed as an advisory member of the Finance and Capital Strategies Committee, the Public Engagement and Development Committee, the National Laboratories Committee, and the Investments Committee, effective immediately through June 30, 2026.

Upon motion of Regent Cohen, duly seconded, the recommendations of the Special Committee on Nominations were approved, Regents Anguiano, Batchlor, Brooks, Chu, Cohen, Komoto, Kounalakis, Leib, Makarechian, Milliken, Myers, Reilly, Sarris, and Wang voting “aye.”

## 10. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

### *Amendments of Bylaw 40.3 – Special Provisions Concerning Faculty; Standing Order 105.1 – Organization of the Academic Senate; and Standing Order 105.2 – Duties, Powers, and Privileges of the Academic Senate*

At the July 2025 meeting of the Board of Regents, notice was served that at the next regular meeting of the Board of Regents, the Regents:

- A. Amend Bylaw 40.3 – Special Provisions Concerning Faculty, as shown in Attachment 3.
- B. Amend Standing Order 105.1 – Organization of the Academic Senate and 105.2 – Duties, Powers, and Privileges of the Academic Senate, as shown in Attachment 4.

Chair Reilly recalled that these amendments had been discussed during the July meeting for approval at this meeting. The amendments would update the titles of lecturers to professor of teaching and update the name of the former Hastings College of the Law to UC Law – San Francisco.

Upon motion of Chair Reilly, duly seconded, the recommendation was approved, Regents Anguiano, Batchlor, Brooks, Chu, Cohen, Komoto, Kounalakis, Leib, Makarechian, Milliken, Myers, Reilly, Sarris, and Wang voting “aye.”

## 11. **REPORT OF INTERIM, CONCURRENCE, AND COMMITTEE ACTIONS**

Secretary and Chief of Staff Lyall reported that, in accordance with authority previously delegated by the Regents, action was taken on routine or emergency matters as follows:

Approvals by Interim Action

A. The Chair of the Board and the Vice Chair of the Board approved the following recommendations:

- (1) *Alternative Housing Arrangements and a Lump Sum Payment for a Relocation-Related Tax Liability for Julio Frenk as Chancellor, Los Angeles Campus*
  - a. Approve, within policy, alternative housing arrangements for Julio Frenk, as Chancellor, Los Angeles campus, consistent with Regents Policy 7708: Policy on University-Provided Housing.
  - b. Approve, within policy, authorization for the President of the University, or his delegate, to negotiate, approve, and execute a short-term lease for a temporary residence within all of the following parameters:
    - i. Rent per day not to exceed \$700.
    - ii. Property in good condition.
    - iii. Close proximity to or on the UCLA campus.
    - iv. Short term lease until the Chancellor's Residence is habitable as a personal residence that otherwise satisfies the employer-provided lodging exception in Internal Revenue Code Section 119.
  - c. Approve, within policy, the authorization for the President, or his delegate, to negotiate, approve, and execute all related documents associated with securing alternative housing arrangements for the Chancellor of the UCLA campus, following appropriate action pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act.
  - d. Approve, as an exception to policy, a one-time lump sum payment of \$134,700 to Chancellor Frenk to offset the tax liability he incurred from moving-related expenses and reimbursements associated with relocating his primary residence from Florida to the Chancellor's Residence in Los Angeles, California.
- (2) *2025–26 Systemwide Salary Program Increases for Certain Level One Senior Management Group Members and an Employee in the Managers and Senior Professionals Program and Implementation of 2024 Increases for Cynthia Larive as Chancellor, Santa Cruz Campus*

Approval of a 2025–26 systemwide salary program general increase of 3.2 percent, within policy, for Jenny Kao as Vice President and Chief of Staff to the President, Office of the President, increasing her annual base salary from \$400,680 to \$413,688, effective July 1, 2025.

Approval of a 2025–26 systemwide salary program general increase of 3.2 percent, within policy, for Tricia Lyall as Secretary and Chief of Staff to the Regents, increasing her annual base salary from \$345,300 to \$356,352, effective July 1, 2025.

Approval of implementation of the July 2024 4.2 percent general increase and the September 2024 28.5 percent market-based salary adjustment, within policy, for Cynthia Larive as Chancellor, Santa Cruz campus, increasing her annual base salary from \$593,592 to \$795,000, effective July 1, 2025. The 2025 systemwide salary program general increase of 3.2 percent, effective July 1, 2025, has been approved by President Drake and will be applied to the salary of \$795,000, pending approval to implement the two 2024 increases, which will bring her salary from \$795,000 to \$820,440.

Approval of a 2025–26 systemwide salary program general increase of 3.2 percent for Michael V. Drake as President of the University, increasing his annual base salary from \$1,308,000 to \$1,349,856, effective July 1, 2025.

The resulting base salaries shall constitute the University's total commitment for base salary until modified by the Regents, President, or Chancellor, as applicable under Regents policy, and shall supersede all previous oral and written commitments. Compensation recommendations and final actions will be released to the public as required in accordance with the standard procedures of the Board of Regents.

(3) ***Resolution to Exclude Access to Classified Information***

That the following Regents of the University of California will not require, will not have, and can be effectively and formally excluded from, access to all classified information disclosed to the entity and do not occupy a position that would enable them to adversely affect the organization's policies or practices in the performance of classified contracts.

NAME	TITLE
Sonya Brooks	Regent
Brian Komoto	Regent
James B. Milliken	Regent and President of the University
Ann Wang	Regent

**(4) *Appointment of Nana Smith as Associate of the President***

Approval of the following items in connection with the appointment of Nana Smith as Associate of the President:

- a. Appointment of Nana Smith as Associate of the President, effective August 1, 2025 and extending through the period of President James B. Milliken's appointment as President of the University of California. The appointment as Associate of the President is without salary.
- b. This appointment is subject to Regents Policy 7106: Policy on the Associate of the President and the Associate of the Chancellor, as approved by the Regents July 2007 and amended January 2010.
- c. A budget for the Associate of the President in the amount of \$30,000 for 2025–26 will be included as a discrete item in the budget of the President's immediate office.

B. The Chair of the Health Services Committee and the Vice Chair of the Health Services Committee approved the following recommendation:

***Authority to Indemnify Epic, Irvine Campus***

That the Regents authorize the President of the University (or his designee) to:

- (1) Approve the Epic License Agreement, Epic Hosting Agreement, (the "Epic Agreements").
- (2) Approve provisions in Epic Agreements that extend Epic access to UC Irvine Health affiliates.
- (3) Approve provisions in agreements pursuant to which UC Irvine Health indemnifies Epic for the conduct of UC Irvine Health affiliates.

**12. REPORT OF MATERIALS MAILED BETWEEN MEETINGS**

Secretary and Chief of Staff Lyall reported that, on the dates indicated, the following were sent to the Regents or to Committees:

**To the Regents of the University of California**

A. From the Secretary and Chief of Staff to the Regents, the UCLA Chancellor's statement to the campus community in response to the recent announcement by the federal government regarding the suspension of certain research funding to UCLA. August 1, 2025.

- B. From the President of the University, a letter to the UC community regarding the suspension of a large number of research grants and contracts at UCLA. August 2, 2025.
- C. From the President of the University, a statement regarding the federal administration's \$1 billion settlement request from UCLA. August 8, 2025.
- D. From the President of the University, *Annual Report on Undergraduate Admissions Requirements and Comprehensive Review for the fall 2024 admission cycle*. August 21, 2025.
- E. From the President of the University, *Report on Health Systems Transactions approved by the Health Services Committee for the period from July 1, 2022, through June 30, 2025*. August 21, 2025.
- F. From the Secretary and Chief of Staff to the Regents, communication forwarding a link to letters from the U.S. House Committee on Education and the Workforce addressed to UC San Francisco and UCLA. August 26, 2025.
- G. From the President of the University, *Annual Accountability Report, Executive Summary*. September 10, 2025.

**To the Members of the Finance and Capital Strategies Committee:**

- H. From the President of the University, *Significant Information Technology Projects for the period January 1, 2025 through April 30, 2025*. August 21, 2025.

The meeting adjourned at 5:05 p.m.

Attest:

The Secretary and Chief of Staff

University of California [campus] Police Department  
UC [campus] PD Policy Manual

---

# Military Equipment

## 1.1 PURPOSE AND SCOPE

The purpose of this policy is to provide guidelines for the approval, acquisition, and reporting requirements of military equipment (Government Code § 7070; Government Code § 7071; Government Code § 7072).

### 1.1.1 DEFINITIONS

Definitions related to this policy are set forth by Government Code § 7070:

**Governing body** – The elected or appointed body that oversees the Department.

**Military equipment** – Includes:

- Unmanned, remotely piloted, powered aerial, or ground vehicles.
- Mine-resistant ambush-protected (MRAP) vehicles or armored personnel carriers.
- High mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicles (HMMWV), two-and-one-half-ton trucks, five-ton trucks, or wheeled vehicles that have a breaching or entry apparatus attached.
- Tracked armored vehicles that provide ballistic protection to their occupants.
- Command and control vehicles that are either built or modified to facilitate the operational control and direction of public safety units.
- Weaponized aircraft, vessels, or vehicles of any kind.
- Battering rams, slugs, and breaching apparatuses that are explosive in nature. This does not include a handheld, one-person ram.
- Firearms and ammunition of .50 caliber or greater, excluding standard-issue shotguns and standard-issue shotgun ammunition.
- Specialized firearms and ammunition of less than .50 caliber, including firearms and accessories identified as assault weapons in Penal Code § 30510 and Penal Code § 30515, with the exception of standard-issue firearms.
- Any firearm or firearm accessory that is designed to launch explosive projectiles.
- Noise-flash diversionary devices and explosive breaching tools.
- Munitions containing tear gas or OC, excluding standard, service-issued handheld pepper spray.
- TASER® Shockwave, microwave weapons, water cannons, and long-range acoustic devices (LRADs).
- Kinetic energy weapons and munitions.
- Any other equipment as determined by a governing body or a state agency to require additional oversight.

# University of California [campus] Police Department

UC [campus] PD Policy Manual

## *Military Equipment*

---

### **1.2 POLICY**

It is the policy of the University of California [campus] Police Department that members of this Department comply with the provisions of Government Code § 7071 with respect to military equipment.

#### **1.2.1 COMPLIANCE PROCEDURE**

The University of California [campus] Police Department will ensure that all Department members comply with this policy and the policies that govern the use of equipment defined as military equipment. The UC [campus] Police Department shall conduct an annual audit. The Chief of Police or their designee will be notified of any policy violation(s). If needed, the violation(s) will be referred to an internal complaint investigation and handled according to UC [campus] Police Department's Personnel Complaint policy. All instances of non-compliance will be reported to the UC Board of Regents as part of the annual military equipment report.

Any member of the public can register a complaint, question, or a concern regarding military equipment use by sending their question via email to [campus email address]. The Chief of Police or their designee will respond in a timely manner.

### **1.3 MILITARY EQUIPMENT COORDINATOR**

The Chief of Police should designate a member of this Department to function as the military equipment coordinator. The responsibilities of the military equipment coordinator include but are not limited to:

- (a) Acting as liaison to the governing body for matters related to the requirements of this policy.
- (b) Identifying Department equipment that qualifies as military equipment in the current possession of the Department or the equipment the Department intends to acquire that requires approval by the governing body.
- (c) Conducting an inventory of all military equipment at least annually.
- (d) Collaborating with any other law enforcement agencies that may use military equipment within the jurisdiction of the University of California [campus] Police Department (Government Code § 7071).
- (e) Preparing for, scheduling, and coordinating the annual community engagement meeting to include:
  1. Publicizing the details of the meeting.
  2. Preparing for public questions regarding the Department's funding, acquisition, and use of equipment.
- (f) Preparing the annual military equipment report for submission to the Chief of Police and ensuring that the report is made available on the Department website (Government Code § 7072).

# University of California [campus] Police Department

UC [campus] PD Policy Manual

## *Military Equipment*

---

### **1.4 MILITARY EQUIPMENT INVENTORY**

The following constitutes a list of qualifying equipment for the UC Police Departments:

[See attachment UC Police Military Equipment Inventory.pdf](#)

### **1.5 APPROVAL**

The Chief of Police or the authorized designee shall obtain approval from the governing body by way of an ordinance adopting the military equipment policy (Government Code § 7071(a)(1)).

As part of the approval process, the Chief of Police or the authorized designee shall ensure the proposed military equipment policy is submitted to the governing body and is available on the Department website at least 30 days prior to any public hearing concerning the military equipment at issue (Government Code § 7071(b)).

The military equipment policy must be approved by the governing body prior to engaging in any of the following (Government Code § 7071(a)):

- (a) Requesting military equipment made available pursuant to 10 U.S.C. § 2576a.
- (b) Seeking funds for military equipment, including but not limited to applying for a grant, soliciting, or accepting private, local, state, or federal funds, in-kind donations, or other donations or transfers.
- (c) Acquiring military equipment either permanently or temporarily, including by borrowing or leasing.
- (d) Collaborating with another law enforcement agency in the deployment or other use of military equipment within the jurisdiction of this Department.
- (e) Using any new or existing military equipment for a purpose, in a manner, or by a person not previously approved by the governing body.
- (f) Soliciting or responding to a proposal for, or entering into an agreement with, any other person or entity to seek funds for, apply to receive, acquire, use, or collaborate in the use of military equipment.
- (g) Acquiring military equipment through any means not provided above.
- (h) This approval is intended to permit the Department to maintain the quantities of military equipment at the quantities that were last approved by the governing body. Accordingly, the Department can engage in any of the activities listed in 905.6(a)-(g) without seeking additional approval as long as the Department does not exceed the pre-approved quantity.
- (i) **MILITARY EQUIPMENT USE CONSIDERATIONS**
  - (a) The military equipment acquired and authorized by the Department is (Government Code § 7071(d) (1)):
    1. Necessary because there is no reasonable alternative that can achieve the same objective of officer and civilian safety.
    2. The military equipment use policy will safeguard the public's welfare, safety, civil rights, and civil liberties.

# University of California [campus] Police Department

## UC [campus] PD Policy Manual

### *Military Equipment*

---

3. Reasonably cost-effective compared to available alternatives, if any, that can achieve the same objective of officer and civilian safety.
4. Military equipment shall only be used by a Department employee only after applicable training, including any course required by the Commission on Peace Officer Standards and Training, has been completed, unless exigent circumstances exist.

### **1.6 COORDINATION WITH OTHER JURISDICTIONS**

Military equipment used by any member of this jurisdiction shall be approved for use and in accordance with this Department policy. Military equipment used by other jurisdictions that are providing mutual aid to this jurisdiction shall comply with their respective military equipment use policies in rendering mutual aid. Situations may arise where the Department may deploy or use military equipment, as defined, owned by other law enforcement agencies. The Department hereby adopts the military equipment use policy as is approved, and may be amended from time to time, under Government Code section 7070 et seq., for jurisdictions that the Department may engage with to provide mutual aid. This section is in no way a limitation to the ability of the Department to deploy or use the military equipment of another jurisdiction.

### **1.7 ANNUAL REPORT**

Upon approval of a military equipment policy, the Chief of Police or the authorized designee should submit a military equipment report to the governing body of each type of military equipment approved within one year of approval and annually thereafter for as long as the military equipment is available for use (Government Code § 7072).

The Chief of Police or the authorized designee should also make each annual military equipment report publicly available on the Department website for as long as the military equipment is available for use. The report shall include all information required for the preceding calendar year for each type of military equipment in the Department inventory (Government Code § 7072).

The annual military equipment report shall, at a minimum, include the following information for the immediately preceding calendar year for each type of military equipment:

- (a) A summary of how the military equipment was used and the purpose of its use.
- (b) A summary of any complaints or concerns received concerning military equipment.
- (c) The results of any internal audits, any information about violations of the military equipment use policy, and any actions taken in response.
- (d) The total annual cost of each type of military equipment, including acquisition, personnel training, transportation, maintenance, storage, upgrade, and other ongoing costs, and from what source funds will be provided for the military equipment in the calendar year following submission of the annual military equipment report.
- (e) The quantity possessed for each type of military equipment.
- (f) If the law enforcement agency intends to acquire additional military equipment in the next year, the quantity sought for each type of military equipment.

# University of California [campus] Police Department

## UC [campus] PD Policy Manual

### *Military Equipment*

---

#### **1.8 COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT**

Within 30 days of submitting and publicly releasing the annual report, the Department shall hold at least one well-publicized and conveniently located community engagement meeting, at which the general public may discuss and ask questions regarding the annual military equipment report and the law enforcement agency's funding, acquisition, or use of military equipment (Government Code § 7072(b)).

**Assembly Bill 481 (AB 481)**



**Prepared by:**  
**UC COUNCIL OF CHIEFS OF POLICE**

**SEPTEMBER 2025**

## UC POLICE DEPARTMENT ANNUAL REPORT 2025 OF MILITARY EQUIPMENT

University of California Police Department Policy “Military Equipment” requires an annual report to be submitted to the Regents on an annual basis and posted on the police department website for as long as the equipment is in use.

### *Annual Report*

*Upon approval of a military equipment policy, the Chief of Police or the authorized designee should submit a military equipment report to the governing body of each type of military equipment approved within one year of approval and annually thereafter for as long as the military equipment is available for use (Government Code § 7072).*

*The Chief of Police or the authorized designee should also make each annual military equipment report publicly available on the Department website for as long as the military equipment is available for use. The report shall include all information required for the preceding calendar year for each type of military equipment in the Department inventory (Government Code § 7072).*

*The annual military equipment report shall, at a minimum, include the following information for the immediately preceding calendar year for each type of military equipment:*

- (a) *A summary of how the military equipment was used and the purpose of its use.*
- (b) *A summary of any complaints or concerns received concerning military equipment.*
- (c) *The results of any internal audits, any information about violations of the military equipment use policy, and any actions taken in response.*
- (d) *The total annual cost of each type of military equipment, including acquisition, personnel training, transportation, maintenance, storage, upgrade, and other ongoing costs, and from what source funds will be provided for the military equipment in the calendar year following submission of the annual military equipment report.*
- (e) *The quantity possessed for each type of military equipment.*
- (f) *If the law enforcement agency intends to acquire additional military equipment in the next year, the quantity sought for each type of military equipment.*

#### ***A. How Used and Purpose of Use***

All campuses train annually on their equipment which requires the use of ammunition where applicable. The following campuses deployed equipment in a non-training setting:

- UC Davis (UCD) deployed drones 11 times for patrol and special events.
- UC Los Angeles (UCLA) deployed the following:
  - Approximately 240 PepperBall Pava Powder projectiles were used during an incident involving an aggressive crowd. None of these rounds were aimed at individuals and there were no reports of these rounds directly impacting any person.
  - The Long Range Acoustic Device (LRAD) equipment for crowd management was used approximately 71 times during incidents.
  - One Def-Tec 40mm eXact Impact Munition Model #6325 was used during an arrest when a suspect put their hand near a police officer's firearm.
- UC Santa Cruz (UCSC) used the LRAD equipment for crowd management.

#### ***B. Complaints or Concerns***

UC Berkeley (UCB), UCD, UC Merced (UCM), UC San Diego (UCSD), UC San Francisco (UCSF), UC Santa Barbara (UCSB), and UCSC Police Departments received no complaints or concerns during the fiscal year regarding the purchase or use of military equipment or the military equipment policy.

UC Irvine (UCI) received one complaint after the publication of last year's annual report, following the public AB 481 meeting held on August 28, 2024. The 2024 annual report was subsequently updated to include the complaint.

UCLA received three complaints related to incidents involving the use of AB 481 equipment. UCLA was not the agency that deployed the equipment in those incidents.

UC Riverside (UCR) received several complaints from community members related to its AB 481 inventory during its annual public meeting. The complaints centered around the possession of military equipment, not a particular item in its inventory or deployment.

#### ***C. Internal Audits***

All campuses conducted audits of their military equipment and there were no violations of the policy found.

#### ***D. Total Costs and Funding Source – Fiscal Year 2025-2026***

UCD, UCM, UCR, UCSF, UCSB and UCSC did not purchase any new military equipment during this fiscal year.

The chart below details purchases made by campuses.

Campus	Purchased	Amount
UC Berkeley	Winchester Ammo Remington .223	\$4,470.00
	Hornady 80625 Ammo Remington .223	\$1,422.00
UC Irvine	Ammo	\$7,576.12
UCLA	(2) PepperBall VK-SBL Pro launchers	\$2,762.00
	(5) 375 PepperBall Live-X Pava Powder Projectiles	\$1,244.00
	(50) 20 PepperBall YXR Live-X Pava Powder Projectiles	\$4,360.00
UC San Diego	(3) Def-Tec 40mm launchers	\$5,190.00

(Continued on next page)

*E. Quantity*

## AB 481 Military Equipment Inventory

Categories and Descriptions	UCB	UCD	UCI	UCLA	UCM	UCR	UCSD	UCSF	UCSB	UCSC	Total
<b>Category 1 - Unmanned, remote Piloted, Powered Aerial or Ground Vehicles</b>											
Remotec Andros F6A Robot	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (drone)	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (drone)	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
<b>Category 10 - Specialized firearms and ammunition of less than .50 caliber, including assault weapons as defined in Sections 30510 and 30515 of the Penal Code, with the exception of standard issue service weapons and ammunition of less than .50 caliber that are issued to officers, agents, or employees of a law enforcement agency or a state agency</b>											
Sig-Sauer MCX 5.56 Short Barrel Rifle (SBR) Patrol Rifle			20								20
Sig Sauer M400	12								12		24
Colt Carbine (LE 6721)							49				49
Colt Carbine (LE 6940)					5**			7			12
Colt Carbine (LE 6943)							5				5
Colt M4 Model (LE6933)	12	20									32
Colt Carbine (LE 6920)					15**	10		5	5		40
Colt Enhanced Patrol Rifle EPR (16")			22			7	1			23	31
Colt M4 Carbine 5.56 Patrol Rifle							50				50
Windham AR-15 .223, WW-15 (simmunition training only)									2		2
Ruger AR 5.56 Patrol Rifle (Model 08500)											50
Hornady #80625 .223 Remington	2,000				500						2,500
Hornady 5.56 TAP Rifle Rounds 75gr HP					9,600						9,600
LMT AR 5.56 Patrol Rifle						10					10
Speer LE Centerfire .223 Rem 60 Grain Ammunition						5,500					5,500
Speer Gold Dot .223 Ammunition (Duty)									6,000		6,000
Federal American Eagle .223 Ammunition (Training)									21,500*		21,500
Winchester Ammo (Remington .223)	3,000										3,000
Winchester Ammo (Remington .223) (Duty 64 grain bonded Hollow Point)									53,000		53,000
Winchester Ammo (Remington .223) (Range 55 grain Full Metal Jacket)									54,000		54,000
Winchester Ammo (Remington .223) Frangible			10,000								10,000
Winchester .556 Rifle Rounds (Duty 64 grain bonded Hollow Point)			4,000	13,500		3,000				4,000	24,500
Winchester .556 Rifle Rounds (Range 55 grain Full Metal Jacket)			5,000	12,000	16,000		12,000			9,000	54,000
Winchester .556 Rifle Rounds (Range 55 grain Full Metal Jacket)								5,000			
<b>Category 11 - Noise-Flash Diversionary Devices and Explosive Breaching Tools</b>											
Def-Tec Multi-port Plus II Distraction Device Model #8922	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	10
<b>Category 12 - Munitions Containing Tear Gas or OC Excluding Standard Service Issued Hand-Held Pepper Spray</b>											
FN Herstal 303-5 18mm Rounds (PAVA/OC)	300	0	150	0	0	0	105	1350	0	0	1905
Def-Tec 40mm Direct Impact Munition Model #6320 (OC)	5	0	0	41	0	0	5	4	0	0	55
Def-Tec 40mm Direct Impact Munition Model #6322 (CS)	5	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	0	0	28
FTC PAVA Capsaicin Rounds	0	0	0	1600	0	0	750	0	0	0	2350
Def-Tec MK-9 Pepper Spray (OC) Canisters, Model #5099	8	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
FTC PAVA Capsaicin Rounds	0	0	0	3000	0	0	0	0	0	0	3000
<b>Category 13 - Taser Shockwave, Microwave Weapons, Water Cannons, and Long Range Acoustic Devices</b>											
Long Range Acoustic Device (LRAD)	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	11
Long Range Acoustic Device (LRAD)			1								1
<b>Category 14 - Kinetic Energy Weapons and Munitions</b>											
FN Herstal 303 Launcher	4	1	1	0	1	5	1	4	1	1	19
FN Herstal 303-3 18mm Rounds (Washable Paint)	150	285	0	0	0	200	105	1350	0	200	2290
Def-Tec/LMT 40mm Launcher (Models #1327, #1425, #1426, #1460R)	0	5	18	18	6	7	12	14	15	11	106
Def-Tec 40mm eXact Impact Munition Model #6320	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	100
Def-Tec 40mm eXact Impact Munition Model #6325	100	141	165	300	0	80	93	172	175	55	1281
Def-Tec 40mm Bean Bag Round Model #6025	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	0	0	22
Def-Tec 40mm Training Munition	0	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	0	75
FTC Pepper ball Rifle	0	0	0	4	0	0	2	0	0	0	6
PepperBall VK-SBL launcher	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
PepperBall Live-X Pava Powder Projectiles (375 count)	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
PepperBall YXR Live-X Pava Powder Projectiles (50 count)	0	0	0	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
PepperBall VK-SBL launcher	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
PepperBall Live-X Pava Powder Projectiles	0	0	1000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1000
PepperBall YXR Live-X Pava Powder Projectiles	0	0	500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	500
Penn Arms 40mm L640-3 Launcher	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Penn Arms 40mm L140-3 Launcher	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
CTS 4557 40mm Sponge Round Spin Stabilized Direct Impact	600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	600
CTS 4557-01 Inserts 40mm Sponge Reload	600	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	600
FN Herstal 303 Launcher	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Def-Tec 40mm eXact Impact Munition Model #6325	0	0	35	100	0	0	0	0	150	0	285
Def-Tec/LMT 40mm Launcher (Models #1327, #1425, #1426, #1460R)	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	10	7	0	22
PepperBall VK-SBL launcher	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
FN Herstal 303 Launcher	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Def-Tec 40mm eXact Impact Munition Model #6324	0	0	0	0	100	0	0	0	0	0	100
Def-Tec 40mm eXact Impact Launcher Model #6324	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	5

\* UCSB corrected inventory amount from 2024

\*\*UCM corrected model number of rifles, total quantity has not changed

Legend	
Black Ink	Current Inventory
Red Ink	Request for approval for new equipment
Blue Ink	Requests to add additional equipment to existing inventory
Green Ink	Removed from inventory
Purple Ink	Pending delivery from manufacturer

***Inventory Corrections***

- UCSB corrected previously reported inventory count of munitions from 19,500 to 21,500.
- UCM corrected previously reported rifles with the correct model number. The total count has not changed.

***F. Request for New Military Equipment***

UCB, UCD, UCM, UCR, and UCSC do not request new equipment. UCI, UCLA, UCSB, UCSD, UCSF are requesting the following inventory:

***Request For Category 1 - Unmanned, Remotely Piloted, Powered Aerial Or Ground Vehicles—The Use Of Drones By University Of California Police Departments***

UCSD is requesting to purchase two (2) unmanned aerial vehicles/systems (drones) to assist with patrol operations and special event safety. UCB, UCLA, UCSC and UCSF previously requested to purchase drones and are working on a systemwide purchase contract for the best pricing.

UCB continues to research robot platforms from the 2024 request.

***Request For Category 10 – Specialized firearms and ammunition of less than .50 caliber, including assault weapons or greater, excluding standard-issue shotguns and standard-issue shotgun ammunition***

UCSD is requesting to purchase 5,000 rounds of 5.56 patrol rifle ammunition at a cost of approximately \$3,300.00 to replenish rounds used during training.

***Requests For Category 13 – Taser Shockwave, Microwave Weapons, Water Cannons, and Long Range Acoustic Devices***

UCI is requesting to purchase an additional Long Range Acoustic Device to provide evacuation and dispersal directions at more than one location (UCI Campus and UCI Medical Centers).

(Continued on next page)

***Requests For Category 14 – Kinetic Energy Weapons And Munitions***

UCI is requesting to replenish (35) Def-Tec 40mm eXact iMpact Munition for SRT members. In addition, requesting to purchase the following new equipment:

**Type:** PepperBall VK-SBL

**Quantity:** 5

**Cost:** Approximately \$1,481 each

**Lifespan:** No lifespan indicated by the manufacturer. Lifespan varies on operational usage and wear.

**Capability:** Can fire munitions with a maximum effective range of one hundred fifty (150) feet.

**Manufacturer Description:** The VK-SBL offers all the features of the VKS PRO™ in a lighter and smaller form factor. Able to deploy both .68 caliber round or long-range VXR™ projectiles, the VK-SBL has a shorter barrel, a 7-inch handguard, and a reflex sight. The VK-SBL easily adapts to different roles and situations, from routine patrols to specialized operations, while maintaining accuracy and control



**Type:** PepperBall PAVA Projectiles

**Quantity:** 1,000 rounds

**Cost:** Approximately \$1,000

**Lifespan:** Three years

**Capability:** Can fire munitions with a maximum effective range of one hundred fifty (150) feet.

**Manufacturer Description:** A powerful concentration of 5% PAVA powder. Excellent for direct impact, area saturation and crowd control approximately 150 feet.



**Type:** PepperBall Paint Marking Projectiles

**Quantity:** 500

**Cost:** Approximately \$2,200

**Lifespan:** Three years

**Manufacturer Description:** The VXR™ Marking™ projectile contains a paint solution that can be used to mark suspects for later apprehension and/or marking doors, openings, or objects for identification.



UCLA is requesting to increase existing inventory by the following amounts:

- Def-Tec 40mm eXact iMpact Munition Model #6325 by 100 rounds.
- Def-Tec/LMT 40mm Launcher by 5
- PepperBall VK-SBL Launcher by 4

UCM is waiting for delivery of previously requested and purchased equipment. Delivery is anticipated in 2025.

- Def-Tec 40mm launchers by 5
- Def-Tec Model #6324 eXact iMpact 40mm Sponge Round by 100

UCSB is requesting to increase existing inventory used during annual training:

- Def-Tec 40mm eXact IMpact Munition Model #6325 by 150

#### ***EXPIRED EQUIPMENT***

*All expired equipment will be stored out of use until safe disposal can be arranged.*

UCSB has the following inventory that has reached the manufacturers expiration date. These items will be replaced with exact models using department funds. **Note:** Inventory will be reduced by one (1).

- Def-Tec 40mm Launcher Model #1625 by 7

UCSF has the following inventory that has reached the manufacturers expiration date. Some items will be replaced with exact models using department funds.

#### *Replaced using department funds*

- Def-Tec 40mm Direct Impact Munition Model #6320 (OC) by 4
- Def-Tec 40mm Direct Impact Munition Model #6322 (CS) by 18
- Def-Tec Multi-port Plus II Distraction Device Model #8922 by 10

*Will not be replaced*

- Def-Tec MK-9 Pepper Spray (OC) Model #5099 by 4

***TRANSFER OF INVENTORY***

UCLA will no longer use the FN Herstal 303 launcher and will transfer its existing inventory of one (1) to UCR. There is no cost associated with the transfer, and UCR currently utilizes the platform.

\* Additions shown by underline; deletions shown by ~~strikethrough~~ \*

#### 40.3 Special Provisions Concerning Faculty

\*\*\*\*\*

##### (d) Security of Employment

An ~~Lecturer Potential Security of Employment Assistant Professor of Teaching~~ appointed at more than half-time who has completed eight years of service in that title, or in that title in combination with other titles as established by the President, shall not be continued in that title after the eighth year unless given appointment with security of employment.

By exception, the President may approve appointment of an ~~Lecturer Potential Security of Employment Assistant Professor of Teaching~~ on more than half time beyond the eighth year without security of employment, but may not extend it beyond two years.

\* Additions shown by underline; deletions shown by ~~strikethrough~~ \*

### **105.1: Organization of the Academic Senate**

- a. The Academic Senate shall consist of the President, Vice Presidents, Chancellors, Vice Chancellors, Deans, Provosts, Directors of academic programs, the chief admissions officer on each campus and in the Office of the President, registrars, the University Librarian on each campus of the University, and each person giving instruction in any curriculum under the control of the Academic Senate whose academic title is Instructor, Instructor in Residence; Assistant Professor, Assistant Professor in Residence, Assistant Professor of Clinical (e.g., Medicine); Associate Professor, Associate Professor in Residence, Associate Professor of Clinical (e.g., Medicine), Acting Associate Professor; Professor, Professor in Residence, Professor of Clinical (e.g., Medicine), or Acting Professor; ~~Lecturer with Potential for Security of Employment~~ Assistant Professor of Teaching, ~~Lecturer with Security of Employment~~ Associate Professor of Teaching, Acting ~~Lecturer with Security of Employment~~ Associate Professor of Teaching, ~~Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment, or Acting Senior Lecturer with Security of Employment~~ Professor of Teaching; however, Instructors and Instructors in Residence of less than two years' service shall not be entitled to vote. Members of the faculties of professional schools offering courses at the graduate level only shall be members also of the Academic Senate, but, in the discretion of the Academic Senate, may be excluded from participation in activities of the Senate that relate to curricula of other schools and colleges of the University. Membership in the Senate shall not lapse because of leave of absence or by virtue of transference to emeritus status.

\*\*\*\*\*

### **105.2: Duties, Powers, and Privileges of the Academic Senate**

\*\*\*\*\*

- c. The Academic Senate shall determine the membership of the several faculties and councils, subject to the provisions of Standing Order 105.1(c), except the faculties of ~~Hastings College of the Law UC Law San Francisco, and San Francisco Art Institute~~, provided that the several departments of the University, with the approval of the President, shall determine their own form of administrative organization, and all Professors, Associate Professors, Acting Professors, Acting Associate Professors, and Assistant Professors, and all Instructors of at least two years' service shall have the right to vote in department meetings.