Resolution expressing no confidence in the Regents and President of the University of California

Sponsors
Dylan Quitiquit Hoffman (Porter College Appointed Representative)
Adham Taman (Porter College Appointed Representative)

Whereas on November 5th, 2014, University of California President Janet Napolitano announced to the leadership of the University of California Student Association and the Council of Student Body Presidents her intent to submit a “long-term stability plan” to the Regents for adoption at their November meeting scheduled just two weeks later;

Whereas President Napolitano’s plan increases tuition and fees up to five percent annually over the next five years, depending on the level of support provided by the Governor and Legislature, potentially raising mandatory system tuition and fees nearly 28%, or up to $15,560 by 2019;

Whereas tuition and fee levels for any given academic year beginning in the fall would not be determined until the state budget is adopted in June, undermining the claim that the plan provides stability for families and putting student leadership in a perpetual crisis mode of seeking increasing funding from the state to avoid increases;

Whereas Assembly Bill (AB) 970 was passed in 2012, creating Section 66028.3, subsection (b) of the California Education Code requiring that the University of California consult the University of California Student Association at least forty days prior to the adoption of any increase to mandatory system tuition and fees and provide at minimum:
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1) A justification for the fee increase proposal, setting forth the facts supporting the fee increase;
2) A statement specifying the purposes for which revenue derived from a fee increase will be used;
3) A description of the efforts to mitigate the impact of the fee increase on needy students;
4) The potential impact to students, including, but not limited to, the changes to the minimum workload burden for all students, if applicable, institutional financial aid awards, and the average student loan debt for undergraduates; and
5) Alternative proposals that can be considered in lieu of the proposed net student fee revenue proposal;

Whereas the University of California is only required to comply with AB 970 to the extent to which the University enacts the provisions of the law, failing to do so in the two years since its passage.3;

Whereas students recognize the strain placed on the University of California as a result of drastically diminished funding from the State of California despite the university's daunting challenges of addressing the wall of pension debt for university employees, maintenance for aging infrastructure and growth of new campuses, and commitment under the Master Plan for Higher Education to accept the top one-eighth of graduating high school seniors and transfers from the California Community Colleges4;

Whereas students recognize the need for the Governor of California to more aggressively invest in the University of California by increasing the annual apportionment provided by the state, including allocating far above the paltry 4.5% of total revenues generated from the provisions of Proposition 305;

Whereas the plan adopted by the Regents relegated students to the status of political pawns to be used in a power play between the university and the state in what the Los Angeles Times referred to as a hostage situation, despite our status as the largest contributor of revenue to the budget of the University of California6;

WHEREAS, on November 19th, 2014, over a hundred UCSC students traveled to the University of California, San Francisco campus before sunrise to join other UC students in protest against the plan; and

WHEREAS, on November 20th, 2014, hundreds of people from multiple UC campus communities including undergraduates, graduates, faculty, and workers rallied and protested on campus against the tuition hike policy stated above7;

Whereas the Regents, ignoring the concerns of over ten-thousand signatories of a petition circulated by the University of California Student Association, overwhelmingly voted to adopt the
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plan 14-7, with the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Speaker of the Assembly, Superintendent of Public Instruction and Regents Pérez, Oakley, and Saifuddin voting against adoption⁸;  

Whereas establishing a task force with broad representation of stakeholders to investigate spending in the university budget would both identify savings opportunities as well as undermine criticism the university is unwilling to examine its expenses before requesting more revenue;  

Therefore be it resolved that the Student Union Assembly expresses no confidence in the Regents and President of the University of California and their ability to effectively govern the University of California; and  

Therefore be it further resolved that the Student Union Assembly condemns the Regents and President of the University of California for adopting a tuition plan that seeks to increase tuition by five percent annually over the next five years beginning in the 2015-2016 academic year; and  

Therefore be it further resolved that the Student Union Assembly denounces the Regents and the President of the University of California for continuously dismissing the protests of students and statements from the University of California Student Association in their decisions including, but not limited to, the appointments of President Napolitano⁹ and Student Regent-designate Abraham ‘Avi’ Oved¹⁰; and  

Therefore be it further resolved that the Student Union Assembly rebukes the Regents and President of the University of California for failing to implement the provisions of AB 970 passed in 2012 that called for consultation of students prior to the increase of any system tuition or fees; and  

Therefore be it further resolved that the Student Union Assembly maintain no confidence in the Regents and President of the University of California until such time that the following demands are satisfied:  

1) The repeal of the “long-term stability plan” adopted by the Regents at their November meeting;  
2) Full implementation of the statutory provisions of AB 970;  
3) The creation of a task force with representation of student, faculty, represented staff, administration, alumni system leadership and the California Department of Finance charged with investigating the budget of the University of California and submitting a report of its findings, including opportunities for realizing savings and resolving inefficiencies, to the Regents and Department of Finance; and  

Therefore be it further resolved that the Student Union Assembly, as the official legitimate voice of the undergraduate student body, shall stand with conviction on the side of the students who oppose these tuition increases and will work collectively with other student groups throughout California to oppose these measures which stand so deeply opposed to affordability of education. The Student Union Assembly will adopt the attitudes of Student Solidarity as well as

UC Solidarity in how it proceeds regarding student action against the “long-term stability plan.”; and

**Therefore be it finally resolved** that the Student Union Assembly direct the External Vice Chair to support any resolution to the University of California Student Association Board of Directors expressing the same at its January meeting at the University of California, Santa Cruz.