



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

August 1, 2025

—
Steven W. Cheung
Chair, Assembly of the
Academic Senate
Faculty Representative,
UC Board of Regents
Academic Senate

James B. Milliken
President, University of California

Katherine S. Newman
Provost and Executive Vice President, Academic Affairs

Office of the President
1111 Franklin Street
Oakland, CA 94607

Academic Senate Division Chairs

Re: UCAD Interim Report and Recommendations

senate.universityofcalifornia.edu

Dear President Milliken, Provost Newman, and Division Chairs,

—
CAMPUSES

Berkeley
Davis
Irvine
UCLA
Merced
Riverside
San Diego
San Francisco
Santa Barbara
Santa Cruz

On behalf of the Academic Council, we are pleased to forward the enclosed interim report of the [Academic Senate Task Force on UC Adaptation to Disruptions](#) (UCAD) for your consideration. The Academic Council endorsed the report at its July 23, 2025 meeting and urges Senate divisional leaders and senior administrative leaders on the campuses and at the Office of the President to review the preliminary recommendations for responding to significant external threats to the University.

We ask Senate division chairs to share the report with their divisional councils, and also request that President Milliken and Provost Newman share it with Board of Regents Chair Reilly, campus chancellors, and executive vice chancellors/provosts. We emphasize that this is an interim report intended to structure systemwide conversations about how UC can adapt to emerging disruptions while continuing to fulfill our core mission.

MEDICAL CENTERS

Davis
Irvine
UCLA
San Diego
San Francisco

Given that the divisions may be in different positions with respect to their ability to adopt certain recommendations, we recognize they will pursue actions that best suit the needs of their campus. We encourage shared divisional Senate-administration decision-making in determining campus-specific responses to the situation at hand.

NATIONAL LABORATORIES


Lawrence Berkeley
Lawrence Livermore
Los Alamos

As we transition into the 2025-26 academic year, the Senate task force will continue to deliberate on issues not addressed in this iteration of the report and will prioritize engagement with each of the aforementioned constituencies for robust exchanges regarding the proposed recommendations. The aim is to solicit feedback to help converge toward

consensus on key recommendations before the Senate issues the UCAD report in a finalized form in the fall.

Please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions. Thank you for your partnership.

Sincerely,



Steven W. Cheung
Chair, Academic Council



Ahmet Palazoglu
Vice Chair, Academic Council
Chair, UCAD

Encl.

cc: Academic Council
2025-26 Academic Council Vice Chair-Designate Scott
Vice President and Chief of Staff Kao
Chief Policy Advisor McAuliffe
Senate Division Executive Directors
Senate Executive Director Lin



Systemwide Academic Senate Task Force on UC Adaptation to Disruptions (UCAD)
Interim Report & Recommendations
July 23, 2025

Introduction

The [Academic Senate Task Force on UC Adaptation to Disruptions](#) (UCAD) was established by the [Academic Council](#) in April 2025 in response to growing concerns about the University’s ability to sustain its teaching, research, and public service mission areas amid political volatility and external disruptions.

Recognizing the need for a faculty-led response to these disruptive conditions, the Council charged UCAD with evaluating risks and developing strategies across four areas: 1) restructuring academic programs, 2) resizing programs and the workforce, 3) recalibrating growth objectives, and 4) realigning funding sources with mission activities. The UCAD charge and membership is attached as Appendix A.

Since its formation, UCAD has met weekly, drawing on the expertise of Senate faculty leadership in consultation with systemwide administrative partners. This interim report presents UCAD’s initial recommendations in four key areas:

- 1. Research Funding Assistance**
- 2. Academic Personnel Evaluations During Disruptions**
- 3. Program Resizing and Restructuring**
- 4. Need for Flexibility in Course Offerings and Modalities**

These preliminary recommendations focus largely on the first two areas outlined in the original charge and are intended to be a starting point for continuing discussion. They will evolve as UCAD continues its deliberations and external conditions develop. In the coming months, UCAD will turn its attention to the remaining areas—3) recalibrating growth objectives and 4) realigning funding sources with mission activities—and issue additional and updated recommendations as part of its ongoing work.

1. Research Funding Assistance

Background

Incremental erosion of public support for scientific investigation, coupled with a sudden shift in White House priorities, have led to major disruption of research at UC and other universities across the country. Federal executive orders have defunded research in a multitude of interconnected ways that amplify their effects. Budget cuts to funding agencies weaken grantor service infrastructure; delay the grant submission, review, and approval process; and reduce the number of awards. The proposed dramatic reduction of the maximum facilities and administrative (F&A) rate to 15% endangers the sustainability of the infrastructure necessary to support all research moving forward. Award suspension and termination profoundly impact the ability of principal investigators (PIs) to conduct scholarly activity, impede graduate student and postdoctoral training, and degrade other core components of the University's central mission. Finally, ideologically-based funding curtailment of certain topics—notably, projects that are alleged to involve “illegal” diversity, equity, and inclusion activities—threaten academic freedom and harm individual faculty PIs.

The termination or indefinite suspension of an awarded research project has both near-term and long-term impacts on faculty and trainees. In the near term, research work and trainee support are disrupted. In the long term, faculty academic progress and candidacy for advancement and promotion are jeopardized. There is an urgent need to provide institutional support for faculty researchers experiencing disruptions by implementing three complementary interventions:

1. **Bridge funding** for research grants that are temporarily caught up in “stop work” orders and likely to be reinstated following brief delays or court actions.
2. **Transition funding** to *ramp down* impacted research projects that have no likely prospects for extramural funding reinstatement and to mitigate potential harm to careers of both faculty and trainees.
3. **Research recovery funding** to *ramp up* opportunities for impacted faculty to explore and pivot to new research areas that may attract new extramural funding.

Beyond assistance to impacted faculty, the University should first establish a systemwide inventory of disrupted research programs. That information would inform the development of a coordinated policy and strategy approach to navigate current challenges that are expected to persist for at least a few more years. Without it, the University risks losing a generation of faculty who are unable to thrive as researchers.

Recommendations

For the Divisional Academic Senates & Campus Administrations:

- **Transition Funding:** UC campuses are encouraged to provide transition funding for faculty with grant awards that have been suspended or terminated, and without reasonable likelihood for reinstatement. Monies are used to *ramp down* the activities of terminated awards and provide support to trainees who derive salary support from the defunded

projects. Funding should last for the remaining award period or up to one year, whichever is shorter.

- **Research Recovery Funding:** UC campuses are encouraged to provide research recovery funding for impacted faculty to explore new research ideas. Monies are used for faculty to *ramp up* new research directions to capture preliminary data for the development of competitive extramural grant applications in the near future. Funding should last no longer than two years.

For the Systemwide Academic Senate & UC Office of the President (UCOP) Administration:

- **Bridge Funding:** While bridge funding is campus-based, UCOP and the Senate should partner to develop and implement a unified process to provide support for faculty who received grant awards that have been subject to “stop work” orders—considered to be temporary—and likely to be reinstated following brief delays or court actions. Funding should last up to one year.

For the Campus & UCOP Administrations:

- **Support for Early Career Faculty:** Prioritize institutional support for early career faculty, including research funding, mentoring, closeout activities, and advancement guidance, to support retention and allow individuals to build an academic career. Without timely and proactive efforts, there is a risk of long-term erosion in the academic pipeline.
- **Campus and UCOP Resources:** Campus- and UCOP-based bridge, transition, and research recovery funds 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.
- **Campus Team Support and Systemwide Database:** Create campus teams to support faculty whose grants are at risk of termination, with legal and research development resources. Develop a systemwide database of disrupted research programs, including key information, such as project topic, discipline, funding agency, amount, duration, and other descriptors.
- **Other Research Funding Models:** Examine international models of research sustainability in low extramural funding environments, including how other countries organize research disciplines, share infrastructure, and support early career scholars.
- **Public/Private Partnerships:** Consider public/private partnerships for supporting research programs, especially in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) fields.
- **Equity Monitoring:** Track whether funding agency-based budget-driven decisions are disproportionately affecting historically underrepresented faculty.

For the UCOP Administration:

- **UCOP Philanthropic Fund:** Consider establishing a fund supported by individual donors and institutional partners for transition and research recovery support. This fund would be fully expended over a five-year period in support of *ramp-down* and *ramp-up* needs of impacted faculty across all 10 campuses.
- **California Orphaned Endowments:** For endowments whose original purpose or beneficiary may no longer be feasible or identifiable, the California attorney general makes case-by-case determinations on appropriate distribution or use. UC should advocate for state legislation to release funds from dormant endowments (e.g., 15+ years) to support UC research.
- **Partnership with California:** Engage the State to develop long-term models for sustaining the research enterprise. The California Institute for Regenerative Medicine (CIRM) serves as a model to raise financing, develop governance structure, collaborate with private and public entities, and mobilize advocates.
- **Cross-Campus Collaboration:** Identify innovative research infrastructure funding models that reduce barriers to cross-training and cross-campus collaboration, modifying faculty's course loads or course releases to lower barriers to launch new research projects.

2. Academic Personnel Evaluations During Disruptions

Background

During and after the COVID-19 pandemic, faculty experienced significant disruption to their research programs, which prompted the adoption of Achievement Relative to Opportunities (ARO) principles. This [Monash University](#)-inspired framework allows for more equitable assessment of faculty career progression and achievements in the context of opportunities available to them. At the University of California, these principles outlined how campuses can implement ARO “in a way that simultaneously maintains academic rigor while recognizing the unique contexts faculty members are operating in.”¹

The pandemic was largely viewed as a *force majeure*, a time-limited event that was nonetheless far reaching in impact. With respect to UC research disruption, federal and state governments responded to the financial challenges borne by investigators and sponsors with timely delivery of funding that created a glide path toward an eventual recovery. In contrast, UC research disruption in the current environment is the outcome of targeted federal actions that have resulted in the termination of awarded grants, steep budget cuts to funding agencies, a draconian reduction to the maximum facilities and administrative (F&A) rate, and the wholesale desertion of certain lines of scientific inquiry, among other negative impacts. While making predictions about the future is at best a hazardous endeavor, the intentional retrenchment of federal support for research has already degraded the support infrastructure at multiple levels and will likely lead to the accumulation of deleterious effects for at least several more years. The result may be permanent impacts on the ability of faculty to produce scholarly work. Although some faculty may be able to redirect interests to new research areas, others may lack the means or the opportunity to do so, and even for those who can, the transition may take longer than a single academic review cycle.

The pandemic affected almost every facet of faculty life, ranging from child and elder care responsibilities that consumed residual flexible time to university facility lockdowns that precluded access to laboratories to research subject declinations that impaired progress. In response to pandemic-related disruptions, two earlier reports^{2,3} offered guidance on implementing ARO principles that focused on academic advancement, research recovery, and supportive environments conducive to faculty success. With the assistance of federal and state emergency funds, these reports informed systemwide responses, such as the creation of bridge funding opportunities, academic review period extensions, and greater recognition of invisible labor, which helped mitigate harmful impacts and support faculty success.

¹ Joint Senate-Administration Mitigating COVID-19 Impacts on Faculty Working Group (MCIF-WG) Final Report: https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/_files/reports/rh-senate-divs-mcifwg-report.pdf

² See MCIF-WG Final Report: https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/_files/reports/rh-senate-divs-mcifwg-report.pdf

³ Report of the Academic Planning Council Workgroup on Faculty Work & Recovery Post-Pandemic: https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/_files/reports/js-kn-report-of-apc-workgroup-faculty-work-recovery-post-pandemic.pdf

In parallel, willingness to adopt ARO principles in faculty review during the peri-pandemic period provided much needed short-term flexibility in the advancement and promotion review process. Yet prolonged adoption of peri-pandemic ARO principles indefinitely raises important questions about the long-term expectations for faculty advancement in an era of permanently contracted research funding opportunities. Adapting academic personnel evaluations to a more constrained and uncertain future for higher education research deserves careful consideration.

Recommendations

For the Divisional Academic Senates:

- **Review Period Flexibility:** Communicate clear timelines and criteria for extending advancement review periods for impacted faculty. Processes should be transparent, fair, and consistent across the University.
- **Career Pathways Flexibility:** 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.

For the Systemwide Academic Senate:

- **Systemwide Review of ARO Implementation:** Assess the current state of ARO implementation at the University. The University Committees on Affirmative Action, Diversity, and Equity ([UCAADE](#)), Academic Personnel ([UCAP](#)), Faculty Welfare ([UCFW](#)), and Privilege and Tenure ([UCPT](#)) are planning a joint survey to review ARO implementation practices across UC campuses. Responses from Academic Affairs Offices, Senate Committees on Academic Personnel (CAPs), and other campus entities will create a dataset for analysis to help identify gaps and inconsistencies and inform best practices.
- **Joint Senate-Administration Workgroup on Faculty Evaluations:** In collaboration with UCOP leadership, form a joint Senate-administration committee to consider how faculty evaluations should adapt to this new era of diminished funding opportunities for academic research. The workgroup charge may include:
 - *Developing systemwide ARO principles and processes that can be applied consistently across campuses when faculty experience one-time or ongoing disruptions to activities impacting their career advancement.*
 - *Proposing sustainable models of research infrastructure and reimagined structural support, moving beyond indefinite extensions of pandemic-era ARO accommodation.*

3. Program Resizing and Restructuring

Background

Despite the recent compact with Governor Newsom, and a favorable outcome for the 2025-26 fiscal year with a 3% cut to the UC budget and goodwill for restoration the following year, UC's long-term state funding trend reflects gradual disinvestment on a per capita basis and fluctuating budgets that make long-term planning a challenge. Rising costs, structural deficits, and revenue uncertainty across UC campuses make it clear that the University cannot operate as it has in the past. UC must acknowledge this reality by considering academic program adjustments that preserve its tripartite mission of research, teaching, and public service.

UC faces growing and evolving risks to its core academic mission in the current political climate. For undergraduate student enrollment, planning for change would be prudent. While demand for a UC education continues to increase, it is important to acknowledge that public skepticism about the value of a college degree is growing, especially for certain majors with low enrollment or unclear career outcomes. Adding further complexity are mounting threats associated with increased policy volatility on issues such as student visas and the administration of federal student loan services that may discourage quality applicants from considering UC.

Graduate education is also under pressure, with some graduate programs shrinking even before the current crisis due to rising academic labor costs. The current diminishing research funding landscape will likely exacerbate this trend and lead to smaller graduate programs.

Faculty leadership is critical to navigating these realities and narratives. Faculty must reimagine the future of the UC academic enterprise to ensure continued student success and well-being, leading the efforts to resize and restructure. Such efforts must be proactive and considerate, striking a balance between the need for financial sustainability and the pursuit of universalistic academic knowledge. Budgetary constraints should not drive the academic mission. Faculty must lead this transformation and take bold actions to sustain the University's core activities.

Recommendations

For the Divisional Academic Senates:

- **Review the Size of Graduate Student Cohorts:** Coordinate decisions to resize graduate student cohorts holistically, at the campus level, rather than leaving decisions to individual programs and departments acting unilaterally. Campuses would benefit from a more coordinated and deliberate approach. It is noted that, for some programs, maintaining a viable cohort through yearly admissions cycles may not be possible. This may require shifts in both the teaching and research support provided by new graduate students as well as faculty's overall instructional commitments at the graduate level. Furthermore, there is a significant likelihood that the number of international students who have historically favored UC graduate programs may also decrease, leading to further pressures.

- **Rethink Approaches to Faculty Recruitment:** 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. These positions can help sustain instruction during times of uncertainty, while allowing research-oriented faculty to maintain scholarly progress. At the same time, campuses should evaluate how expanded use of such appointments aligns with the University’s research mission, expectations for Senate faculty teaching, and UC’s commitment to ladder-rank faculty positions supported in whole or in part with state funds.
- **Review Instructional Offerings:** Academic units should consider options for consolidating their instructional offerings through a variety of strategies such as increased use of relevant cross-listed courses, redesigning curricular requirements, and formal collaborations with units on other campuses to maintain the diversity of courses available to students. Overall, units, schools, and campuses should consider ways to streamline instruction while achieving financial sustainability and maintaining academic quality.
- **Prioritize Academic Quality and UC’s Comprehensive Identity:** When evaluating programs for resizing, emphasize indicators of educational quality (such as graduation rates, learning outcomes, or research output) in addition to financial efficiency. UC must strive to remain a *comprehensive* university offering a full spectrum of academic disciplines, including the arts, humanities, social sciences, STEM, and professional fields. Even as difficult choices are made, breadth of knowledge at UC should be preserved. This means ensuring that core disciplines are represented systemwide.
- **Increase the Role of Academic Program Reviews:** Campuses should strengthen their program review processes for both undergraduate majors and graduate programs. Reviews should occur on a regular cycle and incorporate the new evaluation criteria (see the recommendation to the systemwide Senate below). Importantly, program discontinuation or merger should be an explicit possible outcome of reviews. Conversely, reviews should also identify programs that warrant *expansion or increased investment* due to high demand or strategic importance.

For the Systemwide Academic Senate:

- **Establish Clear Criteria for Academic Program Evaluation and Viability:** The Academic Senate should develop systemwide parameters to assess programs. These criteria should include enrollment trends (e.g., chronically low enrollments or declining demand), student outcomes, cost per student, and alignment with UC’s mission. The criteria must also account for the intrinsic value of scholarly fields. Establishing transparent guidelines for program review and possible sunseting will enable proactive decision-making and avoid ad hoc cuts.

For the Divisional & Systemwide Academic Senates:

- **Adapt Systemwide Guidelines to Fit Campus-Specific Contexts:** While shared overarching principles for academic program reviews are important for systemwide coherence, UC campuses vary in their strengths and constraints. A one-size-fits-all approach will not work. Systemwide recommendations and criteria should be flexible enough to accommodate each campus's unique context. Systemwide guidance should be implemented through campus-level strategic plans that consider local enrollment demand, faculty expertise, and community impact. In short, systemwide policies must empower campuses to make tailored decisions aligned with a common UC-wide vision.
- **Support Faculty-Led Innovation in Curriculum and Program Design:** The UC system should incentivize and fund academic innovation that both reduces costs and enhances student opportunities. This may include developing hybrid and cross-campus programs and launching new or redesigned majors that reflect emerging fields and student interests. Care must be taken, however, to avoid the wishful thinking and “if we build it, they will come” mentality that has plagued past systemwide efforts. Faculty are best positioned to realistically assess student demand and the resources needed to deliver a high-quality UC education. Innovations in curriculum design must be led by faculty, both to ensure academic quality and relevance to our educational mission.
- **Keep Faculty Governance at the Core of Resizing Decisions:** Reaffirm the principle that faculty, through the Academic Senate and local forms of academic governance, must be integral in decisions about restructuring or discontinuing programs. While administrative leaders should work with faculty to provide data and context, academic judgment must rest with faculty in deciding how to reshuffle curricula or merge departments. Engaging faculty early in any resizing initiative ensures that UC will benefit from their insights and gain buy-in for necessary changes. This also helps balance financial considerations with academic values—faculty can identify if a budget-driven cut would inadvertently harm educational quality more than it helps the bottom line. In practice, this means any systemwide program evaluation framework should require evidence of campus-level faculty consultation and support before major changes are approved.

For the Campus & UCOP Administrations:

- **Align Budgeting and Resource Allocation with Academic Priorities:** UC should further develop budgeting models that *both* incentivize efficiency *and* protect core academic values. This could mean modifying revenue-centered budget formulas to include quality metrics (not just enrollment numbers) or establishing campus contingency funds to buffer critical programs from short-term fiscal shocks. The system should articulate principles of “financial sustainability with solidarity” to guide these efforts, indicating that while every program should strive to cover its costs, there is a commitment to *mutual support across disciplines*. Budget cuts should be informed by program evaluations and reviews, rather than implemented as across-the-board reductions. Additionally, UC should enhance

transparency in how funds are allocated to academic units. A strategic budgeting approach will help avoid situations where vital programs are cut simply because they lack immediate revenue, or where pet projects continue unchecked despite poor performance.

- **Evaluate and Right-Size Administrative Support Functions Alongside Academic Programs:** As part of the restructuring effort, campuses should conduct a thorough review of administrative programs and initiatives using evidence of impact on student success and research productivity. For example, services that clearly support academic outcomes such as academic advising, mental health services, and research grant support, should be maintained or even bolstered. In contrast, areas that cannot clearly demonstrate how they directly support the academic mission or that have grown without clear benefit (e.g., duplicative management layers or excessive marketing expenditures) should be streamlined or eliminated. Spending on outside consultants merits particular scrutiny. The system should develop guidelines to help campuses scale back administrative costs, redirecting resources to academic purposes.
- **Reaffirm the Value of Higher Education:** A university degree continues to equip graduates with better potential employment opportunities and remains a powerful impetus for social mobility. Beyond tangible employment metrics, the value of higher education has many intangible benefits inaccessible to metrics, such as fostering critical thinking, civic engagement, and informed citizenship, and supporting self-satisfying intellectual pursuits of deep personal value. Investing in initiatives that communicate the value of a UC education plainly and widely will be essential going forward.

4. Need for Flexibility in Course Offerings and Modalities

Background

Given its delegated authority over courses, programs, and degrees, the Academic Senate responded to recent international student visa disruptions by providing policy guidance, from the University Committee on Educational Policy (UCEP) and the Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (CCGA), to the Senate divisions that reiterated existing flexibilities in Senate regulations available to support students,⁴ including remote access to courses to complete degree requirements. International students requiring maximum flexibility under time-limited circumstances may be allowed to satisfy certain degree requirements by any available course offered by any UC campus.

The initial visa threat underscored both the value of remote education options and the importance of ensuring that remote options meet UC quality standards. It also suggested potential benefits from a systemwide policy framework to facilitate approval of courses and articulation of courses across campuses.⁵ In collaboration with the Senate, UC Online may potentially facilitate the development and offering of shared courses or programs (e.g., language programs) across UC campuses. Such efforts are most likely to succeed if they are grounded in accurate assessments of campus-level needs and capacities and proactively respectful of divisional course review and approval procedures.

Recommendations

For the Divisional Academic Senates:

- **Evaluate Opportunities for Cross-Campus Course Coordination:** Engage collaboratively with divisional undergraduate deans, Senate undergraduate and graduate councils, and UCEP to consider a sustainable model for course approval and articulation and to support hybrid and online options. Lateral agreements between departments across campuses may also facilitate course articulation and support students' degree progress, especially in impacted majors. Ensure this process is bottom-up, grounded in clear data regarding student demand and campus teaching capacity, and consistent with divisional procedures.
- **Plan for Disruption-Responsive Instruction:** Consider establishing systemwide coordination to help relieve pressure on individual campuses should they be faced with limited capacity to mount key gateway or general education courses for students affected by unanticipated disruptions (e.g., visa challenges preventing large groups of students from remaining on UC campuses). Campuses can work with centralized administrative units,

⁴ Academic Support for Students Unable to Complete their UC Degree on a UC Campus: https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/_files/reports/council-chair-provost-re-academic-support-for-students-unable-to-complete-uc-degree-on-a-uc-campus-04-15-2025.pdf

⁵ Such a framework for policy and related procedures could also enable undergraduate students to take full advantage of articulated courses offered through the UC Center in Washington DC (UCDC), the UC Center in Sacramento (UCCS), and the UC Education Abroad Program (UCEAP).

such as UC Online or UCOP Institutional Research and Academic Planning (IRAP), to help meet identified local or systemwide needs.

For the Systemwide Academic Senate:

- **Establish a Systemwide Framework for Course Sharing:** Develop a systemwide policy framework for systemwide course approvals and articulations to enable systemwide recognition of Senate division-approved courses and associated credits across UC campuses. The Senate can partner with UC Online to identify specific courses that would best serve international students who may need to complete their degrees remotely.
- **Convene a UCEP Subcommittee:** Request that UCEP form an ad hoc subcommittee to address the issues outlined in this report section that fall under the Senate's purview.

For the Campus & UCOP Administrations:

- **Expand Cross-Campus Enrollment Opportunities:** Critically evaluate cross-campus enrollment processes to assess the extent to which they serve the needs of students. Develop pragmatic, data-driven ways to expand opportunities for students to make academic progress when local courses are inaccessible or unavailable.
- **Plan for Disruption:** Support the development of online opportunities that meet UC standards through existing divisional course and program review and approval processes. Graduate programs that are heavily reliant on international students should develop curricula that meet UC standards for online approval.



Academic Senate Task Force on UC Adaptation to Disruptions (UCAD)

April 8, 2025

Overarching Goal

The Task Force on UCAD will develop response strategies that aim to uphold the teaching and education, research and discovery, and public service mission areas of the University of California in the context of disruptive federal executive orders, uncertain federal and state partnerships, and evolving shifts in the higher education landscape.

Task Force Charge Goal

The Task Force will conduct relevant analyses and align its planning efforts with UC's longstanding commitment to access, inclusivity, and excellence. The focus will be on assessing current serious threats and developing viable response options across multiple scenarios in each of the following four priority areas:

1. Restructuring of academic programs,
2. Resizing of programs and the workforce,
3. Recalibration of growth objectives, and
4. Realignment of funding sources with mission activities

As core functions of the University and deeply held institutional values are at risk, the Task Force will address these areas both independently and in relation to one another, recognizing their interconnected impacts. The scope of analysis may well extend beyond those listed above, but immediate attention should be given to these priority areas based on the potential harm that could come to students, faculty, staff, and healthcare patients in the near term.

The Task Force is expected to approach issues analytically, with data whenever possible, and to contribute ideas to near-term academic and operations restructuring, as well as recommendations for long-term planning. The Task Force should draw on the expertise of Academic Senate and administrative leaders and consider a broad array of perspectives through timely consultative outreach and engagement beyond its membership, as needed.

Task Force Membership

1. Ahmet Palazoglu, Systemwide Academic Senate Vice Chair & Task Force Chair
2. Steven W. Cheung, Systemwide Academic Senate Chair & UCSF
3. Tim Groeling, UCPB Chair (*Alternate*: Robert Brosnan, UCPB Vice Chair)
4. Susanne Nicholas, UCORP Chair (*Alternate*: Jim Weatherall, UCORP Vice Chair)
5. James Bisley, CCGA Chair
6. Kristen Holmquist, UCAADE Vice Chair
7. Juan Pablo Pardo-Guerra, UCFW Chair
8. Nael Abu-Ghazaleh, UCAP Chair
9. Amani Nuru-Jeter, UCB Senate Division Chair
10. Kathy Bawn, UCLA Senate Division Chair
11. Olivia Graeve, UCSD Senate Division Chair
12. Matt McCarthy, UCSC Senate Division Chair

Administration Consultants

1. Katherine Newman, Provost & Executive Vice President, Academic Affairs
2. Nathan Brostrom, Executive Vice President & Chief Financial Officer
3. Theresa Maldonado, Vice President, Research & Innovation
4. Alex Bustamante, Senior Vice President & Chief Compliance and Audit Officer
5. Yvette Gullatt, Vice President & Vice Provost, Graduate, Undergraduate and Equity Affairs
6. David Rubin, Executive Vice President, UC Health
7. Jody Stiger, Director, Systemwide Community Safety
8. Allison Woodall, UC Legal

Task Force Staff Support

1. Monica Lin, Systemwide Academic Senate
2. Michael LaBriola, Systemwide Academic Senate
3. Stefani Leto, Systemwide Academic Senate
4. Ken Feer, Systemwide Academic Senate

Timeline & Deliverables

The Task Force will deliver recommendations on an ad hoc basis, as needed, to UCOP leadership and an interim report to the Academic Council by **July 16, 2025**, in advance of a planned discussion of the report at the Council's July 23 meeting. UCAD membership and subsequent milestones and/or deliverables will be determined moving forward, given uncertainties in the political landscape.