FACULTY MEETS — SUPPORTS BOYCOTT — REFUSES TO GIVE BINDING POWER TO COLLEGE COMMITTEE OF TWENTY-SIX

Pres. Weaver Appoints 13 Faculty Members To Committee of 26... To Meet Student Reps.

President Robert C. Weaver announced, after the general faculty meeting, that he had appointed thirteen faculty members to fill the vacancies on the Committee of 26. The President said that these members would be appointed temporarily so that they could meet with the students immediately, and that it would be up to the faculty at their meeting today to decide whether to make them permanent or not. This move was seen by students as an attempt by the President to do something about the faculty indecision that was evident at their meeting yesterday. The thirteen members are Professors Berenson, Kweisi, Valsky, Hilbert, Massow, Leibowitz, Levenson, Halboth, Puryear, Frazier, Gayle, Gutman and Dunn.

The Student Coalition of Baruch later made their choices of representatives. The structure of the student choices consists of five students from Day Session, five from Evening Session and three from the Graduate Division. Those picked were, from Day, Tom Swift, Alan Schoenberg, Leon Toney, Mark Cohen, and Steve Hornberger. From Evening Session were Stanley Pomerenz, Earl Fosk, Rodgers, Robin Samules and John Richberg. Graduate students selected were Herb Rothman, Janet Epstein and Val Cavalier.

One demand of the student committee members, which was agreed upon, was that the committee meetings begin no earlier than 3:30 PM so that the Evening and Graduate students would be able to attend.

By JOHN SIKOROHOD

Faculty Adopts Resolution Opposing The General Fee Increase And Supporting Student Protest Efforts...

Professor Aaron Lernerstein opened the emergency general faculty meeting by introducing a resolution, which was subsequently adopted by the 218 assembled faculty members, that the faculty notify the Board of Higher Education that it was opposed to the proposed increase in the general fee, as it was actually tuition in disguise, and that the faculty supported any recognized, legitimate student groups in any non-violent, legal means that they use to protest the proposed increase.

This was interpreted as meaning that boycotting faculty would not be punished.

The emergency meeting was called to discuss the demand of the Baruch Student Coalition that a twenty-six member committee be formed to discuss and act upon student grievances dealing with the college. The students asked that this committee, to be composed of thirteen students and thirteen faculty members, be given decision making power that would be binding on both the students and faculty.

One of the first orders of business that the faculty performed in regard to this motion was to decide whether the thirteen faculty members should be elected from the body or appointed by President Weaver. For this reason, and also so that the faculty could discuss the amount of power that they would give the committee, a recess was called, at which time the student representatives left the meeting to discuss the matter with their colleagues. This was presented to the faculty by the Day Session representatives, Tom Swift, Steve Hornberger, Leon Toney and Joel Salkiner.

Before recesses, however, the Evening Session Student Coalition presented their platform to the faculty, a platform which would (Continued on Page 2)

FACULTY MEETING AT 3:30
Emergency Faculty Meeting Produces Strange Results

(Continued from Page 1)
be taken up by the Committee of 26. Urging the faculty to adopt the committee method. Marie Surry, the Evening Session Rep., said that "the Evening Students are tense and frustrated . . . they feel that no way exists for them to discuss matters with the faculty." The evening proposals were: 1. The continuation of free tuition, no general fee increases, and no non-matric or graduate student fee increase. 2. An Open Admissions program with adequate support facilities and the extension of the SEEK program to all those who are needy. 3. Excused absences for those students who have boycotted classes to protest the fee increases. 4. Make-up examinations for those students who missed exams due to boycotting. 5. A teacher evaluation system. 6. An alternate schedule of general faculty and 26 Committee meetings to allow evening and graduate students to attend. Prof. Surry also expressed support for the demands of the Day Session Students.

After the recess was over and the students returned, President Weaver announced that the faculty had reached the following decisions:

They had agreed on the Committee of 26. However, they had not decided as to how to choose their delegates, that is, whether they should be elected or appointed. The vote on this matter was 58 for appointment and 58 against leaving the members appointed.

Furthermore, the faculty announced that it "wouldn't, and shouldn't give binding authority" to the 26 Committee. They had agreed to give it power to recommend action to the faculty, but that was all. At next Friday, according to the consensus, the 26 committee should have recommendations available.

It was decided to have another faculty meeting this Wednesday in order to determine how the faculty should choose its delegates.

In a voice packed with emotion, Tom Swift announced to the faculty that when news of their decision would reach the students, he and their representatives would not be able to be responsible for any actions that they might take. Immediately some frightened faculty members got up and screamed that this was a threat and an attempt to blackmail the faculty. Committee members got up and screamed that this was a threat and an attempt to blackmail the faculty. Committee members got up and screamed that this was a threat and an attempt to blackmail the faculty. Committee members got up and screamed that this was a threat and an attempt to blackmail the faculty. Committee members got up and screamed that this was a threat and an attempt to blackmail the faculty.

Faculty Indecision

The first reaction that many students had to yesterday's Emergency Faculty Meeting was that it was a poor joke. Petty squabbles over by-laws and the indecision—that was shown on the matter of how they would select their representatives to the Committee of 25 were barely noticeable. Actions that would warrant student confidence in that group of people. However, upon reviewing the entire situation, one comes to realize that what occurred was typical of any group of people, or Student Council meetings. As any meeting one can think of, of even when the most important of issues are at hand, there is bound to be friction that now exists between students and instructors. As President Weaver said to THE TICKER, "It took the students fourteen days to come up with their proposal. We can't expect the faculty to act in three hours." Please remember students, faculty members are just as human as you. They need time to get their heads together. Let's give them a chance. But the faculty must realize that the students are human, and just as you need time to react, remember, don't yell, and try to avoid issues and get caught up in rhetoric, because another thing true to human is that they can get frustrated up to a point, and once that point is reached, they may explode. We don't want faculty and students confronting each other. We urge the faculty to support the common people. As President Weaver has appealed to his committee. Now is the time for serious, constructive dialogue. Let us work together.

Copping Out

When it came time for the faculty to vote on how it would select its representatives to the Committee of 26, the faculty members were in a picnic. When the meeting started, there were over 200 members in attendance. What happened to the other 100? We don't know the time had come to that there was no excuse for any faculty member to leave that meeting. The future of Baruch College was being discussed, and for anyone to think that holding a class, or having dinner, or getting to an outside job was more important than they are operating under a gross misperception. The few days of any member of the college community is the welfare of the college. Anything else, barring personal health or safety, comes second. We have agreed that a repeat of that disgraceful walkout will not occur again. If it does, perhaps attendance should be taken and published, so that the students will know who cares and who doesn't care about them.

50-50

The faculty has voted not to grant binding decision making power to the Committee of 25. While we understand that this has upset many students, we realize that the faculty had good reason for acting as it did.

To give such power to such a small committee would be to concentrate all decision making power in the hands of too few individuals, representative though they may be. It is understandable that the faculty would not want to give up their right to vote on matters concerning them.

However, we do believe that students should have more say in college governance matters than they do now. The first step in the door was made when students were appointed as voting members to faculty committees. Now the time has come to expand the power given to the students from that of a token representation to a real decision making status. There are 10,000 students in Baruch, and approximately 300 faculty members. As things stand now, students have no real say in the matters that the faculty decide—they can be easily voted down. We suggest as an alternative to binding decision making power in the hands of a few that students be given parity on all faculty committees. With a 50-50 student-faculty representation, the internal government of the Baruch College will become a real democracy, and we believe that such a parity would do much to alleviate the friction that now exists between students and instructors. This is not to say, however, that there be no Committee of 26—that is necessary to make proposals for the college community to act upon, and a valuable method for attaining more student input.