

---

## **Resolution Expressing No Confidence in the Regents and the President of the University of California**

### **Sponsor(s):**

Kevin Sabo (UCB AS)  
Caitlin Quinn (UCB AS)  
Conrad Contreras (UCLA AS)  
Abraham Galván Sanchez (UCR AS)

**WHEREAS**, On November 5<sup>th</sup>, 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<sup>1</sup>;

**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<sup>2</sup>;

**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:

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~~<sup>3</sup>;

**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 Colleges<sup>4</sup>;

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.sacbee.com/news/politics-government/capitol-alert/article3938256.html>

<sup>2</sup> [http://www.mercurynews.com/education/ci\\_26978468/uc-regents-approve-tuition-hike-plan](http://www.mercurynews.com/education/ci_26978468/uc-regents-approve-tuition-hike-plan)

<sup>3</sup> [http://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill\\_id=201120120AB970](http://leginfo.ca.gov/faces/billNavClient.xhtml?bill_id=201120120AB970)

<sup>4</sup> [http://ucfuture.universityofcalifornia.edu/documents/ca\\_masterplan\\_summary.pdf](http://ucfuture.universityofcalifornia.edu/documents/ca_masterplan_summary.pdf)

---

## **Resolution Expressing No Confidence in the Regents and the President of the University of California**

**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 30<sup>5</sup>;

**WHEREAS**, The plan 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 California<sup>6</sup>;

**WHEREAS**, On November 18<sup>th</sup>, 2014, students from throughout the University of California system including undergraduates, graduates, faculty, and workers rallied and protested against the tuition hike policy stated above;

**WHEREAS**, On November 19<sup>th</sup>, 2014, students from throughout the University of California system traveled to the San Francisco campus before sunrise to protest with other UC students against the tuition hike policy stated above;

**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 plan 14-7, with the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Speaker of the Assembly, Superintendent of Public Instruction and Regents Pérez, Oakley, and Saifuddin voting against adoption<sup>7</sup>; and,

**WHEREAS**, The Regents of the University of California should listen and be accountable to the concerns and demands of students who are directly affected by their decisions.

**THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, That the Board of Directors of the University of California Student Association expresses no confidence in the Regents and the President of the University of California and their ability to effectively govern the University of California;

**THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, That the Board of Directors of the University of California Student Association condemns the Regents and the 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;

**THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, That the Board of Directors of the University of California Student Association condemns the Regents and the President of the University of California for dismissing the protests of students and statements from the University of California Student Association in their decisions including but not limited to appointments and policy changes<sup>89</sup>;

~~**THEREFORE BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, That the Board of Directors of the University of California Student Association 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~~

---

<sup>5</sup> <http://ucscfa.org/2014/11/cucfa-statement-on-ucs-planned-tuition-increases/>

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.latimes.com/local/politics/la-me-cap-brown-napolitano-20141124-column.html>

<sup>7</sup> <http://www.universityofcalifornia.edu/news/regents-approve-long-term-stability-plan-tuition-and-financial-aid>

<sup>8</sup> <http://www.sfgate.com/education/article/UC-regents-appoint-Napolitano-amid-protest-4673527.php>

<sup>9</sup> <http://dailybruin.com/2014/08/25/student-and-faculty-raise-concerns-about-confirmed-uc-regent-nominees/>

---

## **Resolution Expressing No Confidence in the Regents and the President of the University of California**

**THEREFORE BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED**, That the Board of Directors of the University of California Student Association maintains 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, including but not limited to a memorandum of understanding between the University of California Student Association and the University of California Office of the President;
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.