



December 12, 2025

TO: Ken Barish, Chair
Riverside Division of the Academic Senate

FROM: Iván Aguirre, Interim Chair
CHASS Executive Committee

RE: Proposal: Proposed revisions to Time, Place, and Manner Regulations (Policy 700-70: Expressive Activities)

The CHASS Executive Committee reviewed the Proposal: Proposed revisions to Time, Place, and Manner Regulations (Policy 700-70: Expressive Activities) and found some of the proposed changes deeply troubling in their vagueness. The policy seems to suggest the University's desire to expand its sphere of power to more easily legislate actions of students, faculty, and staff. Upon review, the Committee was unable to find a specific definition of violence and the linked document on UCR Prevention of Violence Policy was unavailable. Given that much of these revisions rest upon defining violence and using this to enforce policy, the Committee considers it necessary to adequately and thoroughly define violence as they envision it.

Some of the obscure language is in part IIIC.1, where an expanded set of restrictions is outlined on sound and thus could be considered "disruptive" campus activity. The proposed policy specifies that "Volume should be kept at a reasonable level and heard audible only in the immediate vicinity of the approved event area." Given the sheer difficulty of disciplining sound from carrying beyond the bounds of a discrete area—especially in reference to an outdoor activity—the Committee is genuinely wondering how the University proposes to adequately and justly survey when sound has exceeded "the immediate vicinity" such as to constitute a disturbance. Also, which campus entities are endowed with the power to determine what volume raises to the level of unruly noise?

The committee also found the guidance (IIIC.3) to render any campus conduct a disturbance concerning insofar as it "unduly interfered with the audience's ability to receive the speaker's or presenter's message." What does this mean? Would the mere presence of an individual or set of individuals be sufficient cause to lodge or act on a complaint of "interference." What is the

process by which this is determined? Again, this is far too vague and too much rests on these interpretations for them to be left unclear and unspecific.

Given these considerations, the Committee considers that this policy, as it is written, can lead to it being used in a range of unintended ways--namely, to curtail student, faculty, and staff behavior around free speech. As it stands, the proposed revisions seem to be tailored around specific activities rather than a more comprehensive understanding of disruptive activities, and the Committee urges the preparers to consider these revisions by more communication with faculty and student governance