



**Academic Senate  
Santa Barbara Division**

**Special Meeting of the Division  
MINUTES  
October 8, 2009**

A Special meeting of the Santa Barbara Division of the Academic Senate was called for October 8, 2009. The meeting was located in Hatlen Theater and began at 3:30PM with Joel Michaelsen, Chair, presiding. Present were approximately 53 members and other interested persons.

Divisional Chair Michaelsen gave a brief presentation on both the short- and long-term conditions that produced the University of California's (UC's) current budget crisis.

The recent sharp decline in UC funding can be attributed to a significant decrease in state revenue and the severe recession over the past two years. However, our recent problems have been compounded by the unstable state funding over approximately the last decade.

While other components of the state budget recovered after the last recession (the dot com collapse), the UC's budget did not experience that recovery. The state appropriation to the UC peaked in 2002, then collapsed, and started to slowly climb back. Overall, the decline in state funding to the UC was only 3%. However, the state budget grew by almost 30% during that period. While the largest percent increase in state funding was for the Department of Corrections (87.6%), the largest dollar increases were in health and human services (\$7.8B) and K-12 education (\$8.9B). After a very short rebound, the state budget collapsed again. If you adjust these numbers for inflation, UC took a 20% budget cut between 2002 and 2008.

In the past decade, UC administrations were hesitant to push the state government for more funding or publicly acknowledge the state's lack of support. There was no strong support for the UC in Sacramento. During the years leading up to our current crisis, if our budget had simply increased at the same rate as K-12 education, the outlook would be much more positive.

At UCSB, the budget over the last 30 years has been significantly impacted by changes in student FTE and state allocations. Our campus has experienced large oscillations in dollars per student FTE, anywhere from \$15,000 to \$11,000 per student, adjusted for inflation; our 2009-10 estimated allocation is approximately \$7,700 per student. State funding would need to be doubled to reach our peak allocation.

Many have suggested that tapping into reserves (both at the Office of the President and on individual campuses) will solve the current budget crisis. While these quick fixes may help in the short-term, they could hurt significantly in the long-term. The reserves are accumulated over a long period of time, primarily from one-time sources such as salary savings, which will not be refilled if they are expended. These funds likely come from thousands of smaller accounts, many of which include non-state sources. Drawing down the reserves may get the University through another year or two, but we will still be left with a significant funding problem. In order to solve our long-term budget problem, the UC needs to improve its relationship with Sacramento and rebuild public support for UC.

Divisional Chair Michaelson opened the floor for discussion.

William Warner, Professor of English, responded to Chair Michaelson's presentation:

While Chair Michaelson's remarks are cogent, they are also very depressing in their suggestion that the University of California has a terribly low position in our perceived value to the state. Although as the Academic Senate of UC Santa Barbara, we are a limited body, one of our most important powers is the ability to speak, and we need to speak cogently, powerfully, and to the moment during this crisis. The voice of the Academic Senate has gone missing, specifically during the University's decision to impose furloughs and to grant emergency powers to President Yudof. How can this body seize an active role in moving forward?

Professor Warner suggested the formation of an emergency budget task force, noting that the Chancellor's Coordinating Committee on Budget Strategy is not the appropriate body to speak for the Academic Senate. In addition, he called for more public meetings aimed at allowing the faculty to grapple with the budget problem.

Professor Warner noted that although a time of crisis is a terrible time to change the captain of a ship or to challenge his authority, we must question whether President Yudof is taking this ship, the University of California, in the wrong direction. First, President Yudof has been profoundly authoritarian, avoiding consultation with the administration and the Academic Senate. Secondly, he has proposed a set of financial remedies that will increase the University's privatization, by raising student fees, accepting fewer California students and more out-of-state and foreign students, and accepting lower levels of state funding. President Yudof seems to have little understanding of the University of California. Thirdly, he is a terrible spokesperson for public education, clearly demonstrated by his interview with the *New York Times*. The interview should have been a savored opportunity for President Yudof to argue the merits of the University, while instead, he compared the faculty to a cemetery. The President claims that he listens to the faculty, but that the faculty do not listen. Truly, the faculty listen very carefully but their opinions are not getting through. Professor Warner suggested that the Division discuss a vote of censure for President Yudof and possibly a request for resignation.

Robert Williams, Professor of Art History, presented the following statement for consideration:

1. UCOP has misrepresented the real nature of the University's financial situation. The "options" with which we were presented in June were not the only ones available, but were calculated to coerce us into accepting measures that UCOP and the Regents wanted to enact. The state cutbacks are being used as an excuse to proceed aggressively with further steps toward transforming the University from a public resource, offering an education to all qualified students regardless of economic background, into a profit-making enterprise, a research facility of benefit primarily to industry and beholden primarily to commercial interests.
2. The emergency powers declaration, approved in July, was unnecessary, an effort to give the budget measures an air of urgency and inevitability that they do not in fact possess. The specific purpose of the emergency powers is to free UCOP's hand to undermine longstanding institutional structures, like faculty governance, and to circumvent financial obligations to faculty, staff, and students.

3. The decision of UCOP (as communicated in the memo of Provost Pitts) to override the expressed will of the Senate by demanding that faculty furloughs be taken on non-teaching days is a direct assault on the principle of faculty governance, a deliberate and offensive effort to undermine and degrade the institutional culture of the UC system.
4. The complicity of the Systemwide Senate leadership in agreeing to, and then justifying these measures (as documented, for instance, in the letter to Pitts by former AC Chair Croughan and other self-styled Senate "leaders") is a betrayal of faculty interests. The response of current Systemwide AC Chair Powell to the letter of the AAUP in support of the Sept. 24 walkout, which has already been protested by our Divisional Chair, was a similarly misguided gesture. The conduct of the Senate leadership throughout this process raises doubts about the ability of the Senate to defend faculty rights and privileges in an effective manner. The Systemwide leadership, in particular, seems to be out of touch with the interests of its constituency.
5. President Yudof's recent interview in the *NY Times* was an embarrassment. His statements showed him to be a cynical opportunist with no commitment to education. He called his own entry into the field of education an "accident;" he claimed that the "shine" had gone off education, and he likened the UC system to a cemetery. Such remarks are an insult to the UC community he is well paid to serve and lead; they are unbecoming to the president of the nation's largest University. They call his fitness for his position into question.
6. As currently mandated and constituted, the Commission on the Future of the UC (also so-called the Gould Commission) is an entity of doubtful value, since Yudof and Regent Gould have a clear agenda for the University that is profoundly objectionable. Despite recent add-ons, made in protest at the make-up of the Commission as originally announced, only 20% of the membership is female, professional schools are overrepresented, and the humanities and social sciences are underrepresented.

In view of these considerations, we propose the following resolutions:

1. The UCSB division of the Academic Senate censures the actions of President Yudof as well as the Regents' support of those actions. We call for the resignation of President Yudof and Provost Pitts.
2. In an effort to restore the public character of the University, we call upon the Regents to make full disclosure of the University's financial records for review by any and all members of the University community, with no prohibition against the public dissemination of that information.
3. We call upon the Regents to redress the imbalances in the membership of the Gould Commission and insist that its findings, when announced, be subject to review, debate, and formal ratification by the University community before any policies based on them are implemented.

Aranye Fradenburg, Professor of English, read the following statement for the Division's consideration:

Whereas the Academic Senate, a representative institution, is charged with the protection of shared governance and faculty privilege, we resolve that:

Its committees make shared governance, the budget crisis and the re-funding of liberal arts education its highest priority for the foreseeable future;

It proactively work with other local Senates as well as Systemwide to pursue these goals;

It report quarterly in Open Senate meetings on its progress.

In particular:

That its Council on Planning and Budget ensure a transparent process of budgetary decision making, including its own deliberations as well as those of the Administration and UCOP;

That its Faculty Issues Council discover, report broadly, and ameliorate UCOP policy-making regarding pension fund investments and the erosion of health and retirement benefits, now and future.

Lisa Parks, Chair of the Department of Film Studies, requested that the Academic Senate establish faculty retention priorities and provide guidance to the department chairs on issues of retention. Chair Parks noted that several faculty in her department have notified her that they are going on the market, and several have already received offers from other institutions. Chair Parks asked, when departments' budgets are shrinking, where will the monies for retention come from? Departments are in great danger of losing faculty during these budget times, particularly junior faculty who can no longer afford to live in the area. What makes UCSB so great are not only the great students but our wonderful faculty and our interdisciplinary climate.

Divisional Chair Michaelsen addressed several concerns from the floor, noting that the request for more meetings and forums is very legitimate. The Academic Senate leadership is currently looking for the best ways to communicate with faculty and poll faculty opinion on important budget issues. Michaelsen agreed to communicate more regularly with the faculty about his meetings at the Systemwide Academic Senate and the Office of the President.

In response to another question from the floor, Michaelsen noted that our Divisional representatives to the University Committee on Faculty Welfare (UCFW) and the University Committee on Planning and Budget (UCPB) can certainly report back to the campus on issues relevant to the faculty. All formal actions proposed by both committees are submitted to the Academic Council for approval.

Chair Michaelsen was then asked to convey the faculty's dissatisfaction at the next Academic Council meeting. It was noted that our faculty are concerned and are restless about the future. Michaelsen responded that he would be glad to carry the Division's general sense of dissatisfaction forward.

In response to a question from the floor regarding President Yudof's *New York Times* interview, Chair Michaelsen noted that the divisional chairs of the ten campuses submitted a letter to *The Times* objecting to the interview. Currently, the chairs are requesting that the letter be published on the Academic Senate website, if it is not promptly published by *The Times*.

Henning Bohn, Divisional Vice-Chair of the Academic Senate and Professor of Economics, discussed his experiences at recent Systemwide meetings. At both the Assembly and the Academic Council meetings, faculty informed the leadership that the furlough was a huge mistake. The faculty voice was definitely heard, but it was ignored. After listening to President Yudof, Vice-Chair Bohn believes that the President has a much better grasp of the University than previous leaders, in particular President Dynes. Vice-Chair Bohn noted that the Regents' mismanagement of the University should be called into question. Vice-Chair Bohn stated that, although Yudof has serious flaws, an attempt to replace him would likely make the situation worse. He urged the Division to think twice about censuring President Yudof.

Divisional Chair Michaelsen also urged the Division to think very carefully about voting to censure President Yudof, and to consider the alternatives the University of California would be faced with if the President were removed from office. Michaelsen has seen improvement in President Yudof's consultation style, and would be happy to speak directly to him about the dissatisfaction of the campus faculty. Chair Michaelsen also noted that he has urged President Yudof to visit the ten campuses and listen directly to the concerns of the faculty.

Members of the Division voiced many diverse opinions about the benefits and detriments of passing a vote of censure.

Professor Williams presented two resolutions for a vote.

1. To censure the actions of President Yudof as well as the Regents' support of those actions.

The resolution passed with 30 in favor, 8 opposed.

2. To append the previous resolution to call for the resignation of President Yudof and Interim Provost Pitts.

The resolution failed with 10 in favor, 20 against.

Professor Williams noted that it would be appropriate for the resolution to go forward for a vote of the Division. Members noted the seriousness of the proposed resolution, and debated the wording of the resolution and several procedural points.

Ultimately, it was decided that Professor Williams would be given the opportunity to edit the language of the proposed resolution to reflect the outcome of the discussion prior to presenting the resolution for a Divisional vote. The final wording of the resolution is included as Attachment A.

The meeting adjourned at 5:24 PM.

## ATTACHMENT A

### For Consideration of the Academic Senate

- 1) UCOP has misrepresented the real nature of the University's financial situation. The options with which we were presented in June were not the only ones available, but were calculated to coerce us into accepting measures that UCOP and the Regents wanted to enact. The state cutbacks, though significant, are being used as an excuse to proceed aggressively with further steps toward transforming the University from a public resource, dedicated to the education of the people of California and the pursuit of knowledge, into a profit-making enterprise, a research facility of benefit primarily to industry and beholden primarily to commercial interests.
- 2) The "emergency powers" declaration, approved in July, was unnecessary, an effort to give the budget measures an air of urgency and inevitability that they do not in fact possess. The specific purpose of the emergency powers is to free UCOP's hand to undermine longstanding institutional structures, like faculty governance, and to circumvent financial obligations to faculty, staff, and students.
- 3) The decision of UCOP (as communicated in the memo of Provost Pitts) to override the expressed will of the Senate by demanding that faculty furloughs be taken on non-teaching days is a direct assault on the principle of faculty governance, a deliberate and offensive effort to undermine and degrade the institutional culture of the UC system.
- 4) President Yudof's recent interview in the NY Times was an embarrassment. His statements showed him to be a cynical opportunist with no commitment to education. He called his own entry into the field of education an "accident;" he claimed that the "shine" had gone off education, and he likened the UC system to a cemetery. Such remarks are an insult to the UC community he is well paid to serve and lead; they are unbecoming to the president of the nation's leading public University. They call his fitness for his position into question.

In view of these considerations, we propose the following resolution:

The UC Santa Barbara Division of the Academic Senate censures the actions of President Yudof as well as the Regents' support of those actions.