



Academic Senate

COMMITTEE ON PRIVILEGE & TENURE

December 11, 2025

To: Kenneth Barish, Chair
Riverside Division

Fr: Jennifer Doyle
Chair, Committee on Privilege & Tenure

Re: **[Campus Review] Proposal: *Proposed revisions to Time, Place, and Manner Regulations (Policy 700-70: Expressive Activities)***

The Committee on Privilege and Tenure reviewed the proposed revisions to Time, Place, and Manner Regulations (Policy 700-70: Expressive Activities). We have major and minor concerns about these revisions.

These revisions do not adequately address our committee's concerns (expressed in our October 30, 2024 memo) regarding ambiguities in these proposed revisions to Time, Place, and Manner Regulations. Nor does this memo address the reactionary nature of elements of the proposed changes that exceed adjustments to policy required by the mandates of the California Budget Act.

Chief Compliance Officer Kiersten Boyce addresses our committee's concerns about policy implementation by pointing to "the 'Attachment A' faculty discipline sanctions guideline chart in the pending request for Academic Senate divisions to address proposed changes to APM-015/016." Attachment A as well as the revised changes to APM 015/016 have been the subject of substantial criticism. Many of those proposed revisions are unacceptable.

In the interest of supporting clear policy regarding time, place and manner, we offer the following minor adjustments.

We question whether a prohibition against climbing "any tree, building, or structure" should be included under expressive activities at all (this appears more directly related to safety rather than time, place, manner restrictions vis a vis expressive activity). If it must be, "This prohibition does not apply to UCR staff or contractors performing authorized work" should be revised to include faculty and students who may be engaged in authorized activities.

Item c under Amplified Sound ("Volume should be kept at a reasonable level and audible only in the immediate vicinity of the approved event area") is potentially overly restrictive (especially for events around the Bell Tower, for example). That noise is audible outside the immediate vicinity

does not necessarily make it disruptive. We propose alternative language in keeping with the language used in other areas of this policy: “Volume should be kept to a reasonable level in the vicinity of the approved event area, and should not disrupt the business of the University outside that area.”

Under the section “Compliance with UCR Officials”, the scope of the requirement that individuals identify themselves should be narrowed. How would this policy be enforced where the person requesting identification is not UCPD, and the person addressed is not an affiliate? Or does this apply to UCR affiliates only? Is verbal identification sufficient?