

Statement by David S. Saxon on student violence directed toward him

November 17, 1975

ACADEMIC SENATE, SAN DIEGO DIVISION

November 17, 1975

MEMBERS OF THE SAN DIEGO DIVISION OF THE ACADEMIC SENATE

As announced in an earlier letter, the main item on the agenda for the November 25 meeting of the San Diego Division of the Academic Senate will be an address and question period with President Saxon. Unfortunately, the pressure of an extremely tight schedule will limit his meeting with the Division to one hour. I encourage you to come ahead of time, or at least on time, so we can start promptly.

Following are three major concerns, as formulated by a subcommittee of the Executive and Policy Committee, which were forwarded to President Saxon with the request that he comment on these issues after his formal address. All time remaining after that commentary will be available for questions from the floor.

1. We are all very concerned about the difficulties in obtaining adequate resources for the UC system, and wish to express the strongest support and appreciation for your continuing efforts towards this end.

However, we note with alarm that UCSD is still behind the other campuses in many indexes such as: Faculty FTE/Student, TA FTE/Student, I&R Support/Faculty, Overhead returned/Overhead generated, Computer instructional funds, and Library funds/Research effort.

We are sure you agree that improvement in these indexes is warranted by our past accomplishments, and essential to our continuing success. We have been assured that your administration has a commitment to achieving funding equality for our campus, but we are distressed that there is no firm time scale. We were shocked to learn that in our recently submitted campus budget the catch-up increments were deleted by your office, even before this budget was presented to the Regents subcommittee. Why was this done, and what hopes are we to have for the future?

2. As you can readily understand, the proposed merger of UCRS with Social Security has raised some concerns. In view of the importance of this issue may we ask:

a) What sources of information and analysis were used by yourself to arrive, at the position taken in your September letter to all members?

b) In particular, did you have the benefits of independent consultants or experts, in this matter (where by independent we specifically mean only those not hired by, or reporting directly to, the UCRS Governing Board)? Part of y(our) decision must include an assessment of the performance of those responsible for the investments.

c) What was the nature of your information from those parties responsible for the investment of our retirement funds and, were any independent views sought in this regard? d) Since an essential part of this issue involves assumptions as to what the Legislature will, or will not, do to fund retirement in the future, and since the other

state employees have better benefits than UCRS, are there any statements of record from legislators, chairmen of the relevant committees, or their members, in which they offer their opinion concerning our possibilities for joining the other state employees'? Should it turn out that there are no such correspondence, would it not be advisable that this route be at least tried, before we have to vote to join Social Security by ourselves

3. Recent testimony before the current United States Senate committee investigating the CIA, and other revelations which have emerged, indicate that the CIA has indulged in numerous illegal activities in clear violation of its charter. In some cases, academic institutions have been used unwittingly. In the light of this, would it not be appropriate, even prudent, to establish a special statewide committee to study and report on the nature of our own past, present, and future relationship with this agency, so as to insure that there have not been, and at the very least, will not be any compromises to our academic integrity?

Sheldon Schultz, Chairman

(November 17, 1975)