

TO: Ken Barish, Chair
Riverside Division

FR: Kurt Schwabe, Chair 
Executive Committee, School of Public Policy

RE: **[Comments] Interim Report of the [Academic Senate Task Force on UC Adaptations to Disruptions \(UCAD\)](#)**

Date: October 3, 2025

The Executive Committee of the School of Public Policy has reviewed the Interim Report of the [Academic Senate Task Force on UC Adaptations to Disruptions \(UCAD\)](#). We appreciate the effort and recommendations provided by the task force, and are in agreement with mass of recommendations and considerations provided. With that said, we have a few additional thoughts that we hope will be useful to consider.

First, regarding Recommendation 1 (*Research Funding Assistance*), although this item is clearly well-intentioned, the suggested funding avenues appear optimistic, particularly given the current state budget (as highlighted in Recommendation 3). Recommendation 1 states that the recommendations “may be financed by reserves, endowments, philanthropic gifts, and other sources. Another option is to access UCOP liquidity in the form of low-interest loans.” Some of these recommendations (for example, philanthropic gifts) would likely have a ramp-up period and thus may not be immediately available to deal with a short-term shock. Similarly, using endowment funds may involve securing donor authorization and could potentially have lasting negative long-term effects on UC.

Second, regarding Recommendation 3 (*Program Resizing and Restructuring*), the report recommends “[Coordinating] decisions to resize graduate student cohorts holistically, at the campus level, rather than leaving decisions to individual programs and departments acting unilaterally.” One challenge with this approach is that programs and departments know their programs best, such as their competitive position relative to other institutions. By shifting responsibility for graduate student cohorts to the campus level, programs and departments may be less able to respond to the needs of their current and prospective students as well as community needs.

Third, and again regarding Recommendation 3 it is recommended that “Campus departments and colleges/schools should consider placing greater emphasis on teaching professorships and joint appointments that can afford greater flexibility to academic units going forward.” One concern with this recommendation is that UC fundamentally is a research institution, as opposed to (for example) the CSU, which focuses on teaching. As a campus that only recently became a member of the AAU, a shift toward more teaching

faculty could potentially impair growth of the research enterprise. Additional hiring of teaching faculty should consider the status of the research enterprise.

Fourth, regarding Recommendation 4 (Need for Flexibility in Course Offerings and Modalities), the report recommends “UCEP to consider a sustainable model for course approval and articulation and to support hybrid and online options.” Although student visa issues clearly highlight the need for compassion and flexibility, it is also important to retain UC’s on-campus offerings and community. When considering additional remote education options, the impact of those offerings on in-person offerings should be carefully considered.

