



COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC PERSONNEL

October 8, 2025

To: Kenneth Barish, Chair
Riverside Division Academic Senate

From: Shaun Bowler, Chair
Committee on Academic Personnel

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Shaun Bowler".

Re: **[Systemwide Review] Report Review: *Interim report of the Academic Senate Task Force on UC Adaptation to Disruptions (UCAD)***

CAP would like to thank members of the Task Force for their work in producing such a thoughtful report. CAP's discussion of the Interim Report made 3 broad points.

1. There is a need for campus-level discussion of adaptation to disruptions

The disruptions being experienced are obviously very serious and of great concern to faculty. The UCAD report is a very helpful beginning point for discussions. A concrete impact that is downstream of these disruptions is that they will be felt in the campus merit and promotion process. Some of this (e.g., how to evaluate teaching in multi-campus courses; what other criteria can we apply for research if grants are cancelled; field work cannot be conducted, etc.) requires more detailed guidance than can be provided in a systemwide document.

In CAP's view there is a need for a campus-level process (e.g. a committee or task force) to develop that guidance in terms of revising the CALL.

CAP's discussion emphasized several points within that general recommendation.

- a. Revisions to the CALL in response to the disruptions should be a bottom-up rather than top-down process with input from departments and programs.
- b. Chairs (or their designate) would be a helpful group to provide input within existing processes and, further, could use departmental discussions over the Department research statement as part of that process of developing a response.
- c. The issues facing us and which promoted the formation of UCAD will not be resolved/settled with one round of consultation/discussion. The situation is ongoing and the consequences of changes are not fully known. Any process should therefore

be set up with this challenge in mind and with a view to being a long-term, ongoing effort. (See also Point 3 below.)

2. De-emphasizing research and emphasizing teaching and service challenges UCR's status as an R1

One sentence in the UCAD document notes that one response to current conditions is to: “Create voluntary pathways for faculty in highly impacted disciplines to shift effort toward teaching and service, with or without formal reclassification of job title series.” (Page 6)

It is possible to read too much into this sentence which refers to a specific – and possibly faculty led – shift.

With that caveat in mind, CAP has concerns about how such a move, if widely encouraged by administration, would change the character of UCR as a research intensive R1.

We are not just an R1 currently; we would like to remain one in the future.

CAP's discussion emphasized that – before moving too readily and more fully to a more teaching and service-oriented model – departments and faculty should explore possibilities of faculty pivoting their research agenda and considering other modalities of research. Support for transition (page 2) should not just be framed in terms of ramping down existing projects but about helping to ramp up new ones, and developing other criteria to value and measure research productivity and advancement of research agendas.

CAP appreciated the point on page 10 about the need to reaffirm the value of higher education. We would also welcome more active public advocacy of support for basic research at the systemwide and campus level—not just by faculty, but by administration, too.

3) Long-term impacts and non-STEM disciplines

The immediacy and size of impacts on grant funding, on graduate student funding, and on international collaboration are of obvious and pressing concern to a number of disciplines, especially within STEM.

We all recognize the seriousness and immediacy of challenges facing lab disciplines. It is appropriate these challenges are given priority.

However, CAP notes that the longer-term impacts will be felt across the entire campus and this includes non-grant intensive disciplines.

Restrictions on areas of research and teaching will have impacts beyond the obvious and immediate impacts being addressed in terms of grants; but have impacts on a broad range of what may be studied, how, and with whom.

This point underscores the need for continuing campus-level discussions over the long term which involve input from all disciplines. Yes, we need to address the issues facing grant intensive disciplines, and we need to do so with some urgency. But the immediacy of the need to address funding problems in the short term should not crowd out discussion of longer-term issues that will impact a very broad range of research and researchers including the arts, humanities, and social sciences.