This supplement is not meant to be read at a sitting. Included in it are the major reports that have been issued this summer and fall by campus groups and committees on the subject of University reform. Most of the reports are printed here in their entirety, gathered together for purposes of evaluation and comparison. It is hoped that this collection of proposals will serve students and faculty as a reference in the coming months as each report comes up for discussion before the Columbia community.

The order in which the reports are presented is a function of mechanical considerations, not an indication of priorities.

The interim report of the Special Committee of the Trustees, released on August 25, is the only statement the Trustees have issued on questions of institutional reform since the spring uprising. According to Alan H. Temple, committee chairman, who recently retired from the Board but continues on the committee, the trustees' final report is not expected for several months.

Two statements adopted by the student representatives to the Temple Committee during the summer follow the Trustees report. Although several individual students have broached restructuring plans to the Trustees, no plan has been accepted by the representatives as a group.

The most extensive plan for reform adopted by students is the work of the Students for a Restructured University, an organization whose ancestry reaches back to last spring's crisis, the period of birth of most of the groups concerned with restructuring. Members of SRU have emphasized that their proposals on the University are not final, but will be continually subject to revision. (A report of SRU's plan in Spectator last week reflected some provisions of an earlier draft which have since been altered.)

The Executive Committee of the Faculty, another descendant of last spring's uprising, created two study groups in the wake of the crisis. The first, a fact-finding commission headed by Archibald Cox, released its report last Saturday; excerpts from its conclusions which are particularly relevant to matters of University reform have been printed at the end of the supplement.

The second study group, the Project on Columbia Structure, directed by Adjunct Professor of Law Frank P. Grad, issued its major recommendations on September 10, in time for a meeting of the Joint Faculties of Morningside two days later. No action has yet been taken on the staff proposal either by the faculty or by the Executive Committee, although the Executive Committee has commended the plan "to the University community as a serious proposal worthy of its earnest consideration."

The Project on Columbia Structure will also issue a summary report on "the problems of governance of Columbia University" in the near future.

Early in the summer Vice President and Provost David B. Truman issued a letter which dealt with various issues involved in reorganizing the University. Vice Provost Herbert A. Deane, working with Assistant Professor of Government James Connor, wrote several essays during the summer on disciplinary questions and on the role of faculty and students in the University. Both the Vice President and Acting President Andrew Cordier have withheld comment on proposals for reform since that time. The essays issued by the Vice Provost's office are thus the main administration statements on restructurings.

During the week of October 21 hearings will begin on restructuring proposals under the joint auspices of the Executive Faculty Committee, SRU, the student representatives to the Trustees, the Columbia University Student Council, and the administration. A seven-man panel, with a rotating membership, will hear testimony on the proposals and will seek to establish areas of agreement and lines of disagreement on the main issues of reform. The ground rules of the hearings will be set by the panel once it is constituted. What will occur after the hearings also remains to be determined. It is expected, however, that after reformulation of the proposals, referenda may be taken among faculty and students on the various plans. If a plan is approved by both constituencies, it will be submitted to the Trustees. But it may be several months before that will happen, and considerably longer before any changes actually take effect.
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To the Trustees of Columbia University:

The Special Committee of the Trustees of Columbia University was appointed at a meeting of the Trustees on May 1, 1958. The mandate given to the Committee was "to study and recommend changes in the basic structure of the University". The Committee was instructed to consult with representatives of the administration, faculty, students and alumni of the University concerning these changes.

At the same meeting the Trustees expressed their appreciation of the widely decommissioned Executive Committee of the Faculty for its constructive efforts. The requests represented by Executive Committee likewise made such a study and recommendations and early as practicable.

The Special Committee has realized pressures to turn it into a vehicle for critical decisions. It is interpreted in mandate as requiring it to move with all feasible speed in such a way that its work of instruction, research and evaluation of opinion and interest of the University.

The Committee has met regularly since its appointment, in order to create a representative body of students, teachers, and staff which will provide it with a clear sense of the views and proposals of students in the school. To this end, the Committee has invited both the dean or director of each faculty or school to meet with our students and representatives.

In these discussions 28 students and 12 alumni representing 13 schools and faculties have been asked to participate.

The Committee has had meetings with these students, with the Columbia University Faculty, with President King. Acting President Coudert and Vice President Sutro.

The purpose of this meeting is to consider the instrumentality for formulating and eliciting the faculty's positions...have not functioned effectively.

The objective of these meetings was set forth at the beginning of the first meeting with students, when the Chairman made the following statement:

I am sure that I speak for all of us when I say that we are here to associate ourselves in common purpose, namely, to determine whether, and to a significant extent and in what ways, the present structure of the University is adequate or defective, and how it should be changed to make it more effective in realizing the great purposes of our University. To this objective the trustees wholeheartedly and earnestly commit themselves.

The idea that the structure through which the University pursues its ultimate educational goal is a manifestation of the educational bodies which have decision-making authority, whose real mission, their role in the University, is to implement the policies and objectives of the University's. The adequacy of these policies and objectives is assessed by the nature of the educational bodies which make them and to the extent that they participate in and understand them with the various groups which constitute the University.

Those who attended these meetings were requested to submit in writing their comments, communication of their views for detailed consideration. We express our appreciation to all those who have worked with us, particularly to those.

At several meetings the Committee has had the benefit of the attendance of Dr. Herman B. Wells, the distinguished former President, now Chancellor and Trustee of Indiana University, who accepted our invitation to assist us, in his time permit, in an advisory capacity.

With financial assistance from the New York Life Foundation, which gratefully acknowledge, the Committee continues its meetings and the long-term consultant firm of Griswold, McCormick and Pape that approach the study in a constructive and thorough manner.

The Board of Trustees of the Columbia University, in his wide experience in this field, and has been meeting with a large number of institutions.

Principles Agreed Upon:

1. Faculty: We recognize the crucial role which the faculty must play only in maintaining academic excellence, but in building an atmosphere of harmony and cooperation in which all elements of the educational community achieve goals most successfully. The faculty of Columbia is advised, and should continue to have major responsibility for selecting new members of the teaching personnel.

2. Students: Students should have a significant part in the governance of the University. The consortium has designated the role of students and their rights in the University's governance. It has also designated the role of students and their responsibilities in the University's governance.

3. Administration: The administration's role is to provide a framework within which the faculty, students, and alumni can work together. The administration's role is to provide a framework within which the faculty, students, and alumni can work together.

4. Trustees: The trustees' role is to provide a framework within which the faculty, students, and alumni can work together. The trustees' role is to provide a framework within which the faculty, students, and alumni can work together.

5. Alumni: The Alumni's role is to provide a framework within which the faculty, students, and alumni can work together. The Alumni's role is to provide a framework within which the faculty, students, and alumni can work together.

6. General: The General's role is to provide a framework within which the faculty, students, and alumni can work together. The General's role is to provide a framework within which the faculty, students, and alumni can work together.

7. Financial: The financial role is to provide a framework within which the faculty, students, and alumni can work together. The financial role is to provide a framework within which the faculty, students, and alumni can work together.

8. Communications: Communications in the University require careful study. "Communications" has been included in an additional role that improves the structure of the University. It has been included in an additional role that improves the structure of the University.

The Special Committee of the Trustees, chaired by Alan H. Temple, was created last May "to study and recommend changes in the basic structure of the University."
Interim Report of the Temple Committee

(Continued from Page 5-2)

mility of the Faculty. We await the results of these studies in the hope that there will come out of them a workable mechanism for the enforcement of discipline without annulling the rights of the students. The Committee approves in principle the participation of students and faculty in disciplinary procedures; such procedures must include provisions for executive action to prevent the University from mass disorders and in other emergencies.

The issues involved in restructuring are profound. Successful solutions of structural problems require not only fresh viewpoints and creative thinking, but also a rigorous examination of proposed operating procedures. In the light of our experience at Columbia and elsewhere, abstract considerations and practical questions both come into account. We must consider what effects restructuring in one area may have in other areas, and how far faculty and student participation in the operation of the University may be expanded without unacceptable diversion of effort and responsibility from the basic functions of teaching and learning, pursuing and extending knowledge, and contributing to the public good. Great care must therefore be taken that changes are weaknesses rather than create others, that excessive rigidity is not succeeded by impregnable walls, and that the University should change the way it operates as a living entity, not a static one, so that our students, faculty, and staff have an opportunity to participate in it.

It would be possible to design a University structure that would be superior for communication purposes, or one whose sole object would be to provide maximum participation. Whether such structures would provide for efficient and effective operation in the University, responding to all its needs and serving all its purposes, is another question.

A university structure, while necessarily complex because of the mix of very different types of educational, administrative, and financial functions, must be built on the premise of a successful operating organization, as simple as possible. A number of students and faculty have thought out a number of workable solutions of the problems and opportunities that it will be possible to find within the University. In the last two years we have tried to bring about a decline of the University's culture to just as considerable an extent as it has declined and diversity will. One of our major responsibilities is to find a proper balance between these changes, that is, the need to preserve, on the one hand, and to restructure that could interfere with the basic educational tasks of the University.

These are simply notations on the complexity of our task. The fact that the issues are so broad is one clear reason why a report at this time can only be of an interim nature. A related and compelling reason is that the reports prepared by other study groups (particularly the extensive research studies being conducted by the Executive Committee of the Faculty and by student groups and the recommendations of the Cressman-McGinn and McKibben reports) will be like unstructured at this point, since they experience the same complexities. The Special Committee cannot make the effort to provide a definitive analysis and recommendations until it has received these reports and had an opportunity to study them and to take what further directions fully into account. The Committee again pledges itself to move ahead with all reasonable speed.

Conclusions

In conclusion, it should be clear that having thus far concentrated on the structure and process of its work, the Committee is moving into the output stage in a spirit not only of determination to accomplish its formidable tasks successfully, but also of hope and confidence. We are confident by many things. The expertise and skills that are being offered to help us are given unselfishly. They come from outside the University, but mainly from within. In the latter case, we cannot deny the experience of an institution or of individuals of high repute in educational institutions and with a record of educational achievement. The process of restructuring could interfere with the basic educational tasks of the University.

“We are impressed by the continuous demonstration that Columbia is not a monolithic institution but has within itself capacity for change and responsiveness. We are impressed by the continuous demonstration that Columbia is not a monolithic institution but has within itself capacity for change and responsiveness. In a degree not always understood.

An example has been given in recent months by the establishment of a bi-partisan, tri-partite, and quadri-partite committee to make revisions and amendments to the existing constitution and by-pass the initiative of deans, directors and faculty. This trend further illustrates the belief that the educational operations of the University were long ago delegate to the Trustees and almost in its capacity for evolution should be considered inviolate.

Our final statement to the Trustees is that we find in the University an enormous spirit not only of good will and respect for the greatness of Columbia's history and accomplishment but also of the need to bring out of this crisis new initiatives to renew progress. One of the responsibilities of those linked with Columbia in any capacity, and particularly in this instance, is to harness this spirit and lead this effort. It is not suggested that the problems are not great; future generations should be able to say the same of us.

If this task is to be done successfully it must be done in a atmosphere of calm, order and good faith. We hope that any who might be pressed to exert pressure through disorderly action against the Trustees will be willing to work with us, not only with us, but to promote by orderly consideration and joint effort and defeated by conflict and disturbances, as a mark of the belief that we are pledged to achieving its potential.

The Student Representatives to the Trustees were elected last spring.

Statement on Restructuring

We are convinced that the rebellion at Columbia last spring cannot be understood simply as the result of a minority or a minority of anarchists; it can only be understood as the culmination of a long-lasting dissatisfaction with the course that the University was taking. The rebellion was not the result of a series of crises; it was the response of many students and faculty to a series of decisions at the administrative level of the University which were seen as abuses of power and counter to the interests of Columbia as well as the community surrounding it.

We must now recognize and respond to the need to restructure the decision-making processes at the University. The symptoms are these: students want to participate in decisions which affect them, the faculty wants to determine and review, in which it has had its recommendations for the University, and the surrounding community demands participation in University planning affecting itself. We believe that any reform of Columbia's structure must deal with, in its first two, however, and we recommend the following guidelines for considering proposals for restructuring:

1. It should be the goal of any plan for restructuring to democratize the University; students and faculty must be included in the decision-making process at all levels. The lack of participation in decision-making which affects them is a symptom of abuse of power. We feel that the University, to be a true community, must include all those concerned in its decision-making which affect them.

2. There should be the University to seek a positive relationship with the surrounding community. Residents of Morningside Heights and West Harlem have often felt that the interests of the University were not the community's. We feel that the University must not be in any way an extension of the majority of residents around it and as such tend to its own ends.

3. In pursuance of the goal of opening society, it should be the policy of the University to allow free access to its plants for development, research, and investment whenever possible. We feel that University restructuring should encompass the ideal of a free University in a free society.

Adopted August 14, 1969

Proposal on Discipline Procedure

1. In the interests of our University, we recommend that all present disciplinary action be brought to an immediate

2. We further recommend that all previous disciplinary action and decisions arising out of the April and May demonstrations be erased from the records of

to faculty and administrative bodies. As is, of course, the practice almost everywhere.

In this respect the present structure of Columbia, which is in our mandate to be restructured, is not a system in which power is diffused but mainly from within. In the latter case, we cannot deny the experience of an institution of high repute in educational institutions and with a record of educational achievement. The process of restructuring could interfere with the basic educational tasks of the University.

“We are impressed by the continuous demonstration that Columbia is not a monolithic institution but has within itself capacity for change.”

With magnificent resources of personal and facility are scholars. We are impressed by the availability of which quality experienced in many areas of our mandates. We choose in the spirit of demonstration that mechanisms for student evaluation of courses and teaching are being developed and that the University is already operating well in several areas.

We are impressed by the continuous demonstration that Columbia is not a monolithic institution but has within itself capacity for change and responsiveness. In a degree not always understood.

An example has been given in recent months by the establishment of a bi-partisan, tri-partite, and quadri-partite committee (faculty, students, administration, and alumni) for various purposes in various divisions -- all without outside interference. The Initiative of dean, directors, and faculty. This trend further illustrates the belief that the educational operations of the University were long ago delegated to the Trustees and almost in its capacity for evolution should be considered inviolate.

Our final statement to the Trustees is that we find in the University an enormous spirit not only of good will and respect for the greatness of Columbia's history and accomplishment but also of the need to bring out of this crisis new initiatives to renew progress. One of the responsibilities of those linked with Columbia in any capacity, and particularly in this instance, is to harness this spirit and lead this effort. It is not suggested that the problems are not great; future generations should be able to say the same of us.

If this task is to be done successfully it must be done in an atmosphere of calm, order and good faith. We hope that any who might be pressed to exert pressure through disorderly action against the Trustees will be willing to work with us, not only with us, but to promote by orderly consideration and joint effort and defeated by conflict and disturbances, as a mark of the belief that we are pledged to achieving its potential.

The Student Representatives to the Trustees were elected last spring.

Statement on Restructuring

We are convinced that the rebellion at Columbia last spring cannot be understood simply as the result of a minority of anarchists; it can only be understood as the culmination of a long-lasting dissatisfaction with the course that the University was taking. The rebellion was not the result of a series of crises; it was the response of many students and faculty to a series of decisions at the administrative level of the University which were seen as abuses of power and counter to the interests of Columbia as well as the community surrounding it.

We must now recognize and respond to the need to restructure the decision-making processes at the University. The symptoms are these: students want to participate in decisions which affect them, the faculty wants to determine and review, in which it has had its recommendations for the University, and the surrounding community demands participation in University planning affecting itself. We believe that any reform of Columbia's structure must deal with, in its first two, however, and we recommend the following guidelines for considering proposals for restructuring:

1. It should be the goal of any plan for restructuring to democratize the University; students and faculty must be included in the decision-making process at all levels. The lack of participation in decision-making which affects them is a symptom of abuse of power. We feel that the University, to be a true community, must include all those concerned in its decision-making which affect them.

2. There should be the University to seek a positive relationship with the surrounding community. Residents of Morningside Heights and West Harlem have often felt that the interests of the University were not the community's. We feel that the University must not be in any way an extension of the majority of residents around it and as such tend to its own ends.

3. In pursuance of the goal of an open society, it should be the policy of the University to allow free access to its plants for development, research, and investment whenever possible. We feel that University restructuring should encompass the ideal of a free University in a free society.

Adopted August 14, 1969

Proposal on Discipline Procedure

1. In the interests of our University, we recommend that all present disciplinary action be brought to an immediate

2. We further recommend that all previous disciplinary action and decisions arising out of the April and May demonstrations be erased from the records of

to faculty and administrative bodies. As is, of course, the practice almost everywhere.

In this respect the present structure of Columbia, which is in our mandate to be restructured, is not a system in which power is diffused but mainly from within. In the latter case, we cannot deny the experience of an institution of high repute in educational institutions and with a record of educational achievement. The process of restructuring could interfere with the delegations powers is wholly consistent with the studies centered around self - regulation and coordination. This
Students for a Restructured University

Students for a Restructured University, an offshoot of last spring's strike committee, estimates that it has between 15 and 4,000 adherents.

Preliminary Remarks

In the process of its summer research, SSDU has constantly revised its view of the value of "restructuring", its possibilities and its limitations. We feel that restructuring should be an adequate means of accomplishing much of the work that is necessary, that as many as possible may participate in the process as the product of restructure.

Proposals

The Department

Since it is the principal goal of the new University to create institutions which most truly represent the interests of those they serve, the greater amount of decision-making power is centered within the departments, and emanates from higher levels of leadership. The departments are often the starting point for legislation dealing with University policy.

There shall be departmental constituencies within each division. Each constituency will form a Departmental Committee, with departmental decision-making power to be shared equally by faculty and student. The Departmental Committee will be empowered to form sub-committees to handle any relevant departmental matters. Representatives to the Departmental Committee shall be elected from the constituencies and be subject to recall by their constituencies. The term of office shall be 12 months, and representatives serving more than one consecutive terms.

Students shall be defined as any person registered to take courses in any division of the University. A member of the faculty in any department shall not serve on the departmental committee.

Departmental curriculum should be decided by a Curriculum Committee. The Division's Committee on Instruction shall have advisory powers over introductory courses which affect students outside the department.

Departmental Coordinating Committee

Each department would elect a committee to act as liaison and coordinating body of the various departmental committees. All members would be elected to one-year terms, subject to recall. No member shall serve more than two consecutive terms.

The departmental constituencies of each of the divisions shall select representatives for interdivisional departmental affairs. The Interdivisional Departmental Committee shall coordinate the workings of the whole department. A departmental chairman shall be elected by the faculty and students in a two-year term, subject to recall. No one shall serve more than two consecutive terms as department chairman.

The Division

The departmental constituencies within which shall elect representatives to a Divisional Coordinating Committee (DCC). This body shall be empowered to establish sub-committees.

The term of office in the Divisional Coordinating Committee shall be 12 months, subject to recall. No member of the DCC shall serve more than two consecutive terms. Committees of the DCC will do the following: draw up the divisional administrative budget; coordinate, in conjunction with the departments, the time schedules involved in setting up a convenient and integrated program; supervise divisional referenda and coordinate the nomination and election of representatives to the University Legislature; coordinate the election of members of the various necessary divisional committees and subcommittees.

The Divisional Committee will decide by departmental committees, the DCOL establishes and revises introductory courses which affect students outside the department.

Powers: The JCL would be the final authority in all University matters, and the final appeal body in all University matters. The Joint Legislature is empowered to change any and all University statutes. The JCL is also empowered to elect the Provost and nominate candidates for University President, whether elected by the entire University community. The JCL will supervise the Central Administration.

Proposed for pass-fail action: Re-call of any member may be initiated by vote of the central administration. All meetings of the JCL will be open, with provision for a gallery for spectators, and all meeting minutes shall be published and maintained for reference by the public. The code of discussion and/or legislation may be submitted to the JCL by any individual constituencies through its representatives. Proposed legislation may also be introduced into the JCL for consideration on petition by at least 100 members of the University community.

The Committee of the JCL consists of members elected by majority vote of the JCL. Committees may also include persons not members of the JCL who are not members of the JCL. Committees may create subcommittees. Committee members shall be elected to 12-month terms, subject to recall by the JCL. No one shall serve more than two consecutive terms.

The functions of the committees shall include the formulation of policy, the enforcement of the administration in their respective areas of responsibility. Screening proposals in the respective areas of responsibility and forwarding recommended legislation to the JCL. The JCL would also be empowered to appropriate funds for the Committee of the JCL.
We reject the concept of the University as a "value-free" institution. We believe that what purports to be value free is usually in essence pro-Establishment by its very failure to challenge the norms and values of our society.

1) Faculty Affairs Committee—members shall be faculty. It will deal with faculty matters and other matters of common interest to the faculty.

11) Physical Planning and Community Relations Committee—Ombudsman will represent community interests. Any expansion must be approved by the committee, that it be in the best interest of the community, and that such expansion will not encroach upon the University.
Submission of Proposals

The staff proposal for the creation of the Executive Faculty Committee is presented with the recommenda-
tions from the study group that the commencement of the Faculty is necessary for study and discussion in ad-
varve. The proposal is based on the consideration of points of view, in accordance with the study group's proposal on "Mechanization for Reform." The present submission consists of several plans for conceptual origina-
ion pointing to the need for a New University-wide Legislative Body. The submission provides a summary outline of the proposal's third, a detailed presentation of the pro-
posal, and the presentation of the proposal's implications. The proposal addresses the following issues:

1. The need for a New University-wide Legislative Body

In a statement on Government of College-
and Universities' Jointly submission, October 12, 1966, by the American As-
sociation of University Professors (AUP), the American Council on Educa-
tion, and the Association of Governing-
Board of Universities and Colleges, the proposal was made that the government

of colleges and universities meddles strengthening in order to respond pro-
to the pressures and needs of our day. The inadequacy of existing Uni-
versity-wide bodies for the governance of Columbia University and for the ex-
pression of the diverse interests of its students, faculty, and other repre-
sentatives of the university community. This proposal is addressed to the

need for a new university-wide legislative body that would permit the students, faculty, and others to participate more effectively in the governance of the university.

Executive Committee

The Executive Faculty Committee "commanded" this staff proposal to the University community's attention when it was Sep-

tember 12.

GI Bill studies are completed. This proposal represents one of the major efforts of the Executive Faculty Committee during the summer. It is in form in advance of the beginning of the new academic year in the hopes that this initiative will be carried into effect by full adoption of this proposal at the beginning of the new academic year in the fall.

In presenting the proposal at this time we wish to emphasize that we believe it is important to share with the community our belief that it is possible to establish a university-wide legislative body that would permit the students, faculty, and others to participate more effectively in the governance of the university.

The Executive Faculty Committee "commanded" this staff proposal to the University community's attention when it was September 12.
Executive Committee Staff Proposal

(Member of the administration will not be able to dominate the University Senate in the same manner in which they have in practice dominated the University Council.)

The interests of the University. The very flexibility of the structure will differentiate the relationship between the administration and the University Senate. The relationships with respect to academic planning, for instance, need not necessarily be the same as those which have developed in the budgetary process or for University-community relations. By now, the membership of the Senate, consisting of representatives of senior and junior faculties, administration, students and alumni, need not all participate equally in each and every aspect of University business. The University Senate, for instance, is not the University Senate. Since such of the constituencies have different priorities of interest, these exist in a dynamic system in the structure of the University Senate and in the faculty body itself. It should be clearly understood that nothing in this proposal foresees that the University Senate will be able to propose legislation to the University, nor will it be able to challenge the jurisdiction or authority of existing bodies, or to interfere with the operation of the councils, schools or faculties.

The University Senate shall have a representative body, with representation from the faculty, students, administration and alumni. The Senate shall consist of the following members:

- 7 members of the administration, including the President, and all other administrators, drawn from the central administration or from among deans of schools and faculties, selected by the Senate;
- 5 alumni representatives, chosen by the members of University alumni organizations or elected by the alumni at large.

The main membership of the Senate shall therefore consist of a maximum of 92 members, depending on the exact number of assistant professors and junior faculty representatives. Members of the University Senate shall serve for a term of years, with the possibility of reappointment in the Senate shall be filled for the unexpired portion of the term in the manner in which the term was originally established. The Senate shall convene at least once each year.

Election of Faculty - For the election of the Senate, the ten senior representatives from the University Senate shall be elected by the University faculty. It should be noted that the inclusion of voting student members on a University Senate will place Columbia University in the forefront of universities providing for student participation in their government.

Election of Alumni. The manner in which the five alumni representatives are to be chosen has been left open. The available choices include election by the alumni of the University's alumni organization, or election by existing alumni organizations.

Department of Administrative Members. The President of the University is to be a member of the University Senate, on appointment of the other six administration representatives have been delegated to him by the Senate. Members of the University Senate were considered inappropriate. Administrators have no "representation" in the same sense as faculty representatives. Rather, they have the characteristics of a president's staff or cabinet and this is more adequately reflected by their appointment.

Comments on Representation

The mode of selection of members of the University Senate is an exercise in the fulfillment two purposes: (1) to give numerical representation to the different constituencies and elements of the University that reflects, to some extent, their relative influence in the University; and (2) to give adequate representation to the University Senate to all the different constituencies of the University community.

The scheme of representation clearly reflects the second purpose: that each student and faculty has been allocated to the University Senate. The scheme of representation will provide for representation of members of the University Senate to be elected by the president of the University. The system of representation will indicate the influence and weight of members of the University Senate to the University. The system of representation will be determined in accordance with the size of the University. The term for participation in the University Senate will be for four years, or until the next Senate election.

Michael I. Seaman

*Federal* model has been followed in some states in that all the different constituencies to the University are represented by at least two members of the University Senate. This model has been followed in the University Senate in the case of the University of Pennsylvania, where the University Senate has been divided into several faculties. The model for the University Senate is that of the University of Connecticut, where the University Senate has two members from each of the different constituencies.
Executive Committee Staff Proposal

It is to be expected that the inclusion of ten student members...will prove to be the most controversial aspect of the proposal.

With ten out of some 92 members, the student voice would be clearly heard, but neither on their own, nor in combination with any other constituency could students adopt policies repugnant to the senior faculty.
Executive Committee Staff Proposal

All 50 senior faculty representatives of the University Senate should constitute themselves into a standing committee on faculty affairs.

"Action of the Student Assembly would normally be referred to the Student Affairs Committee before going to the University Senate."
Executive Committee Staff Proposal

Proposal for a Student Assembly

Commentary and Discussion

The nature of the University Student Senate as it is currently structured assumes the functioning of some form of active Student Assembly comprised of students representing the different branches of the University. The Senate Assembly is a matter on which student initiative and student expressions of opinion have been acknowledged without action. Thus, however, no clear indication has emerged that student groups have any one student body representation in the Senate. Life Report for recent memory. No action on any reformed student body representation which would give the Student Assembly greater power and a fuller degree of participation is regularly afforded to any student assembly in the country, the Student Assembly would roughly mirror the existing faculty and student bodies and the variety of individual student activities, student organizations and publications, and student involvement in the University's activities. In these areas the Student Assembly regulations would become fully effective over the entire student body and be more fully representative. There is need, however, to provide in advance for such emergency calls of the entire faculty, for as recent events at Columbus have shown, effective means for the conviction of the entire faculty in emergency situations are at hand, even without special status or authorization. Under the existing student body, some kind of faculty council could be created as a faculty council. The body would be in itself much smaller than the faculty senate, and its members may either be chosen by the student body or be elected. The first council would be created as a faculty council. This is a faculty council that has jurisdiction over matters of academic policy and faculty interests. Sometimes the role of a faculty council is to serve as a body of discussion of special faculty concerns. It is a faculty council that has jurisdiction over matters of academic freedom. To ensure that the representations on concerns of special faculty interest will be heard and that the exclusion of non-faculty members from the deliberative processes of student bodies when they impinge on concerns that are not special and traditional preserve of the faculty. It is often been suggested that the "4-part" body be provisioned with faculty, student, administration, and public members. It is often been suggested that this be the form of representation that should be provided for. A proposal to accomplish this has been watered down from the form of representation that was suggested. It has been accomplished in this area by the establishment of a parallel faculty council. The faculty council is composed of the University Senate, the faculty council, the student council, and the Public council. The faculty council is composed of the University Senate, the faculty council, the student council, and the Public council. The faculty council is composed of the University Senate, the faculty council, the student council, and the Public council.
Selection From Walsh Report

The basic government of Colmbia follows that of most Americans and Can-
dian universities. The residual power of the Board of Trustees was trans-
ferred to the executive committee. The executive committee was formed
by the faculty of the indi-
cidual school, subject to the approval of the president. Faculty senate ap-
nointments are made by the trustees but always upon the recommendation
of the president. The Board of Regents is responsible for the ap-
proval of the Board of Trustees. The Board of Regent is composed of
the presidents of the various schools selected by the faculty of the
individual schools. The Board of Regents is the executive committee
in the present system. Although the Board of Regents has the
power to appoint the Board of Trustees, the Board of Regents has
no power to remove the Board of Trustees.

The structure of student self-govern-
ment is based on the principle that
students should have complete control
over their association and the implemen-
tation of University policy in the various
schools. Students are the ultimate
power in the University, and in a real
sense, the University is a democracy. The
students have the power to create the
college system as a whole and the
power to change it at will. Students also
have the power to control the faculty
through the election of faculty
representatives to the Board of Trustees.

The Board of Trustees has the
power to appoint the faculty
representatives to the Board of
Trustees. The Board of Trustees
has the power to remove the
faculty representatives. The faculty
representatives have the power to
control the Board of Trustees.

The Board of Trustees is composed of
the presidents of the various schools
selected by the faculty of the
individual schools. The Board of
Trustees is the executive committee
in the present system. Although the
Board of Trustees has the
power to appoint the Board of
Trustees, the Board of Trustees has
no power to remove the Board of
Trustees.
Administration Proposals

Faculty Organization

For some time a significant number of members of the Columbia faculty have expressed strong feelings that 'the lack of effective representation has been a serious impediment in the processes of shaping the policies and plans of the University.' Therefore, the members of the faculty in the current academic year are considering a number of organizational forms that are required, especially at the university level and at intermediate levels between the university and the individual schools and faculties. It is therefore necessary to identify the kind of faculty participation and if the President and Provost of the University are to be the only body with legitimate faculty participation in the complicated processes of discussion, investigation, and decision-making which are the complex university like Columbia.

The following solutions for faculty-organized body, organization, involving, a faculty assembly, senate, and council, are forth coming so that we can present to various groups in the University a draft memorandum that can be presented, debated, and reformulated. We also hope that some of the ideas will be helpful to the various trusts, faculty, and student groups which are wrestling with the difficult problem of faculty organization.

1. Representation
   a. Assembly of all faculty members
   b. Senate or representative body
   c. Committee on faculty organization

2. Assembly
   a. Formation of a faculty organization
      - An organization which involves all three bodies seems preferable, and it will permit a large number of individual bodies to have some role in the running of the university. The assembly should be made up of all members of faculties and all full-time officers of instruction.
      - It would meet at least once a year.

3. Senate
   a. Formation of a faculty organization
      - The Senate could also meet twice a term with the Deans and other administrative officers and with representatives of the staffs, and this combined body could carry out the running functions of the University Council, e.g., passing on changes in degree and certificate requirements, relation with undergraduates, etc.
   b. Faculty council
      - Composition
         - 90-99 members, 2/3 of whom are elected by their respective faculties, 1/3 by the members elected at large by the assembly from a roster of nominees provided by the Senate through faculty nominations. Meetings of two or three times a term. The Senate will elect a President, who will preside at the meetings. The President of the faculty assembly is elected annually by the Senate.

4. Powers
   a. To investigate, evaluate, and make recommendations to the faculty senate on matters covered in B 2, 3, 4, and 5.
   b. To evaluate and pass upon reports and proposals of faculty senate committees.
   c. To propose to the faculty senate the establishment of special committees to investigate and make recommendations on matters of university interest. Such committees will be within the purview of any standing committee.

5. Consideration of the faculty council and recommend appropriate action to the President and Provost in the following areas:
   a. Proposals for changes and improvements in the educational policies of the University:
   b. Proposals to recommend to the President and Provost the annual budget of the University to be submitted to the Trustees, with special attention to the effects of the recent financial policies of the Board on the budget relating to instructional expenses.
   c. Faculty Group
      - It would be inappropriate at this point to spell out specific lines of action in any of the areas which have not yet been determined. However, some principles can be suggested.
      - In spelling out standing committees, the Senate should provide for representation from the faculty assembly on the principle that where the matter under consideration is not one that is of concern only to the faculty, it should provide for student representation on the committee or for consultation and joint meetings with the analogous student committees.
      - The Senate will wish to consider to what extent and in what way student representation may be utilized by the faculty council (e.g., periodic joint meetings of the faculty council and student council). The University-wide faculty council, including of representatives, of the student council, includes the Trustee, the Dean of Student Affairs, the Dean of Graduate Study, the Dean of the College of Liberal Arts and the Dean of Fine Arts.

6. Establish standing committees on matters of continuing interest to faculty members, e.g., nominations, housing, guidance and tenure, committee relations, government-foundation relations, salary and fringe benefits, relationships with University business concerns, recommendations for honorary degrees, etc.

7. On the basis of its committees' proposals, finance reports and recommendations to the faculty council and to the President for transmission to the Trustees.

8. Establish search committees to make recommendations on all faculty appointments, including the appointment of the President and Provost on university-wide committees.


Herbert A. Deane

proposals for the shape and size of the University in the future. They are not a substitute for the Board of Overseers. The aim of this memorandum is to suggest some further considerations that apply to the shape and size of the University. For April are to be consolidated and enhanced.

There are two questions which are of primary importance. First, what can the University do to be more effective? Second, what organizational structure will be most likely to facilitate involvement among the various departments of the University?

As far as the first question is concerned, it might be argued that the University is best structured to be all things to all people. But, really, such a view is not particularly helpful, and it may, in fact, be more necessary to write in a rhetorical figure of speech which covers the whole of the creative product. It is evident, in fact, that the creative product is not as easily divided into discrete units as it is necessary, therefore, to break down forms of student participation into relatively well-defined units.

There are three areas which suggest themselves. First, the academic, which involves the divisional, and the third, the undergraduate. The academic area includes such things as faculty, administrative, and student matters, and the balance between lecture courses, seminars, and collegia. The divisional area is restricted only by that of the faculty, which exercises almost complete autonomy through the departments, and the committees on instruction in the several divisions. The academic area, then, can be divided up into a number of smaller and that particularly close attention be paid to student evaluations of courses and instructors, department and schools make decisions about staffing and promotion. Final decisions of these matters will probably be retained by the faculty, but this should be to preserve the best interests.

Academic Area

In the academic area, organizational structures will be necessary. The following are the major areas:

1. General area
   - The academic area, which involves the divisional, and the third, the undergraduate. It would see the maximum number of students to have the most access to the academic areas which most closely concern them.

Divisional Area

The second, or divisional area covers matters of a rather different nature. Each of the schools in the University is a body with aims, standards, and traditions of its own. Each body of law or medical students differ significantly from those of graduate or professional students. Questions of discipline, extracurricular activities, even academic standards, of the students to have the most access to the academic areas which most closely concern them.

Divisional Area

The third, or divisional, area covers matters of a rather different nature. Each of the schools in the University is a body with aims, standards, and traditions of its own. Each body of law or medical students differ significantly from those of graduate or professional students. Questions of discipline, extracurricular activities, even academic standards, of the students to have the most access to the academic areas which most closely concern them.
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(Continued from Page 5-12)

The faculty should enjoy majority status whenever the competence of the body includes subjects that are not of primarily student interest.

B. Consultative and Grievance Mechanism

In April of every year, all students within the division department shall be convened to elect four or five students within the department to consult regularly with the faculty on departmental matters and convey any student grievances to the faculty. These elected students should be empowered (1) regularly to convene all the departmental business and (2) to discuss with similarly elected students from other divisions of the University matters of cross-divisional interest which are not to be settled at departmental level.

C. Year-end Departmental Audits

One of the specific duties of these elected students should be to select, with the assistance of the department chairman, several graduating students to prepare a year-end audit that will be open to all interested students at the departmental level. These students should assist in the audit committee to participate in an audit that might be a mix of academic ranking of B and above. A graduating student will have greater personal experience in course offerings.

The administration, through the office of the Vice Provost, issued four essays on University reform this summer.

1. Placement of student personnel on research and teaching faculty in the divisional faculty: We believe that the divisional student association should represent the students in the divisional faculty. This association should be elected by the student representatives from all the students in the department. The association will have the right to communicate with the chairman of the department and department representatives or other members of the faculty for all information that they may require. A report should be made by the chairman and the committee of the divisional officer on the activities of the student association.

2. Executive committee of the divisional faculty: The executive committee of the divisional student association will probably wish to elect an executive committee to carry out its meetings and reports. These executive committees should also periodically consult with their respective departments on matters of divisional faculty governance, giving special attention to any general feelings of student discontent over an issue.

3. Student activities and relationship to autonomous student activity group: The in the area of funded student activity suggest that a student activities budget committee formed in each major division of the University shall include a student group membership, and select a student group budget committee from the student body to be elected by the students.

4. Student Groups and the University: The University's independent student groups should be in charge of student participation in departmental decision-making.

October 10, 1968
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Draft Memorandum on Discipline No. 2

1. Rule-making
2. Determination of guilt or innocence
3. Penalty Imposition
4. Penalties

I. University-wide rule-making body

A. Composition
1. Presidents, in what proportion?
2. B. Students
3. Administration

Suggestion: Since all three groups have legitimate stakes in the rule-making faculty body, three people should have representation. We suggest a body of 21 members, 8 students, 8 faculty members, and 5 administrators (e.g., the Deans of Columbia College, General Studies, Engineering, and Graduate Faculties and the Director for Student Interests; the choice of four Deans to choose in a given year might be left to all the Deans).

B. Organization
1. One-shott Commission
2. Interim body
3. Permanent Body

Suggestion: A permanent body should be established. Either one of the ad hoc interim efforts increase the stakes of those who would stall or question the legitimacy of the body while holding for a better deal from another forum.

C. Selection
1. Election
2. Appointment

Suggestion: Students should be elected, directly, by a university-wide student organization. Faculty members should be elected by a university-wide body (e.g., Senate, etc.). The administrators are ex officio.

D. Scope
1. Behavior
2. Process
3. Off-campus
4. Activities
5. Cheating
6. Plagiarism
7. Academic Standing

Suggestion: The behavior and academic issues are probably best separated. Rules concerning purely academic matters should be determined by the University Senate. Questions of cheating and plagiarism are not matters of opinion, and the faculty committee should establish the standards and rules for the university. Each faculty should also establish a body to deal with individual violations of these academic standards. The behavior question is more complex. One is tempted to draw a sharp line between protest and contentious behavior, but the line is not that clear and may even become more blurred in the future. Therefore, it seems wise to leave it up to the faculty and individual universities to determine what the University Senate and the faculty committees should look like to draw up specific guidelines for protest activity.

Presently existing rule-making bodies such as the dormitory councils should be retained. Those that do not try to be effective should be reviewed by the general university. II. Rule-making body rather than by the Senate as is the current system.

II. Determination of guilt or innocence

A. Organization
1. Separate or part of rule-making body
2. Size
3. Frequency of meetings

Suggestion: Leave determination of guilt or innocence to students at the initial stage. The risks that may be involved can be minimized by narrow construction of the tribunal's mandate.

"The leave determination of guilt or innocence should not be allowed to try to reverse the decision by adjudging particular cases in the aggregate, or utilizing a majority body. The case of the tribal body should be kept as narrow as possible. We see the tribunal of three members in each school or division school or a larger school, but a group of three panels, each group could have two or three such members. A regular schedule of the tribunal should be set up for each tribunal, since this would tend to establish the permanence and legitimacy of these bodies.

I. Composition
1. 2 Students
2. 1 Administrator

Suggestion: Leave determination of guilt or innocence entirely to students at the initial stage. The risks that may be involved can be minimized by narrow construction of the tribunal's mandate. If the limits are repeatedly enforced, other methods may have to be tried. If, however, the system works, an important principle is one of student responsibility has been created.

C. Selection
1. Election
2. Appointment
3. LOT

Suggestion: Election places a premium on favors and patronage, so get one's friends elected to tribunals. Any method of appointment on matters that are political, has an odor of backstairs. Selection by lottery, which has behind it the precedents of the random process as well as the JCCM's recommendation, seems preferable. Three, six, or nine (depending on the number of three-man panels in a given school) advanced students chosen by junior members and seniors in the under graduates, second and third-year students in graduate and professional schools should be selected by lot for one-year terms. A student in the body in each school might be set up to dispense a disciplinary tribunal, but a body separate from all others, in another campus, a student may discipline himself because of bias or lack of adequate representation or on the motives of the party. In case, his refusal to discipline himself shall be part of the record.

D. Scope
1. Teachers
2. Students

Suggestion: The scope of the panel in terms of authority should be broad as follows:

(Continued on Page S-15)
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most all cases except academic offenses and those which involve the honor code, etc., should come before the tribunal. However, the tribunal should be concerned only with the act of violation, and not with an infraction of the rules has been committed, and not with the merits of the case. So the entity of an infraction must be a proper and appropriate standard. The size of a surety bond, such as, etc., as the case may be, that the participants in a judicial proceeding disfigure after the event and pursue immorality to commit a victim in good conscience. Our situation, therefore, is analogous to the problem of non-essential policies. It resembles rather a closed regulatory system or a professional society. We wish impartial proceedings and evidences as a matter of course, but our primary aim is to pursue the goals of the small community of which we are a part.

Professor: Walter Gelborem of the Law School agrees with this position and has written the following about the importance of the principle of "substantial evidence":

"The quality of required proof in governmental and quasi-governmental proceedings, determined by administrative tribunals is that the factfinder (such as the President) must be convinced to reasonable confidence in the probability of the existence of a substantial evidence. This, said, Clinton, is a matter of a more than a mere scintilla. It means something more with a reasonable mind might not be enough at adequate to support a conclusion. It is not the kind of evidence on which a reasonable mind is convinced to reasonable confidence in the probability of the existence of a substantial evidence is required. Therefore, Justice Black in the test, is the requirement of "substantial evidence" in a case which has less discretion in imposing penalties.

1. Circumstances
2. By whom?
3. When?
4. Where?

The appeal body can review the penalty as well as the facts of the case and the procedures employed, (see, infra, below). Any student subject to the penalty of expulsion from the university has the right to appeal such decision to the President of the University, who may rescind, reduce, or defer the penalty if he believes that this mitigation is warranted. Reconsideration by the student's judge truant, therefore, is not a matter, but the Dean should remain at the Dean's level. Any student is free to request reconsideration of any penalty, but the Dean is free to refuse. IV. Appeal

A. Scope
1. All university or separate school
2. All cases or some cases
3. Mandate
Suggestion: Any all-university appeal board is desirable because of the recognition problems (finding a sufficient number of individuals to serve on all the committees that are being used, etc.). It is a good idea of the need to establish some university-wide standards of treatment. The appeal board should continue to have this case, which has been dealt with in a school tribunal. Except in this case, the appeal board should not entertain appeals from those students that have been dealt with in a school tribunal. It is not possible for a student to be brought to the appeal board for a decision that has been made by a school tribunal. If a student is brought to the appeal board for a decision that has been made by a school tribunal, he should be brought to the appeal board for a decision that has been made by a school tribunal.
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Excerpt From Cox Commission Report

Three among the purely internal causes of unpopularity impressed us.
1. At a time when the spirit of self-determination is running strongly, the administration of Columbia's affairs too often conveyed an attitude of autocraticism and undemocratic discipline.
2. The machinery of student government had been allowed to deteriorate to a point where Columbia Council had to student government. The Report on Student Life was not released for seven months until CUSC members threatened publication.
3. Columbia, like other universitites, has severely found the extraordinary difficulty of keeping such students in the transition from a society permeated by racial isolation and alienation to a society in which black teaching and administrative personnel, and of appropriate courses and counseling for all students, but the indispensable fact of alienation of our black students, with all that this fact entails, makes a more active and creative search for solutions particularly urgent.

The Table of Columbia was twisted and torn by the forces of political and social revolution outside the University. Columbia's geographic situation symbolizes the relation between white and black, affluence and poverty, privileged reform and established order. The University's need for political expansion in an era of incalculable tensions led its relations with the community toward deterioration because of its apparent insufficiency to the needs and aspirations of its poorer neighbors. The hand with the preeminence of the University thus came, even somewhat unfairly, to emphasize the conflict between the spirit of the civil rights movement and the attack on poverty, on the one hand, and, on the other, the struggle for survival and regime. Energetic and idealistic students alienated from the older generation by an exaggerated adverse side of their mannerisms and interests and offended by the plebeian of suffering, were drawn to the side of change. Where they were frustrated by the massive anomaly of the government and the administrative committee, they could strike out at the more vulnerable University.

In life fashion, the University became the surrogate for all the tensions and frustrations of United States policy in Vietnam.

The desire for student power, while superficially articulating as a cause for student unrest on the campus, was a powerful element of the explosion. Discussion since the spring has focused upon the methods through which students may centre more influence upon the government of an institution of which they are vital and integral parts. Participation in self-government is a natural human desire that today's students feel with great urgency, particularly at institutions with highly selective admissions policies because they are much more educated than their predecessors, more astute, in many respects more mature, and more interested in social problems than seeking out conventional careers. (Unfortunately, they are also much less disciplined.)

The hurricane of social unrest struck Columbia at a time when the University was in the cement that binds direction into an educational cohesive unit.

Again, geography is factor. The complex attractions of the exciting metropolitan area, coupled with the teaching problems that induce a majority of the faculty to live in New York as professional forces, yet the dispersed quality of student life outside the classroom is not beyond the University's power of influence.

The formal organization of both the administrative offices and the faculties apparently tends to discourage the over-easiness that comes from shared responsibility in matters of university concern. We were struck by the constant recall of an apposition between the administration and the faculty as rival bodies with separate interests, for it would be essentially one. The lack of a Senate University and the division of the professors and other teachers into three or four faculties—quite apart from the rigid college system of the universities—have a single Faculty of Arts and Sciences, apparently discountenanced in the formulation of University policy and the improvement of the student life. The centralization to which the full burdens of the quality of student life is left not balanced for the divagation of the college. The directors of the University family are closely involved, outside the classroom, in the constant informal enterprises and discussions by which the values of an academic community are constantly reconceived and which stand the test of time on the next generation.

Institutional coherence is also affected by the presence or lack of a spirit of institutional self-confidence. Unintelligently, despite her inherent strengths, the spring ethos struck Columbia when her self-confidence was shaken by the decline in relative position in AUA rankings of graduate departments, the exclusion from a Ford Foundation grant for improvement of graduate studies, the reorganization of a number of senior professors, and the Strickman flier incident.

A university is essentially a free community of scholars dedicated to the pursuit of truth and knowledge solely through reason and civility.

A mutually-accepted university deems to itself the essential function of wise counselors and managers, who seek and maintain the balance between the large, organized body of alumni and friends. But their vital contribution must never obscure the essential quality of the institution: the university is a community of scholars, both teachers and students. Any tendency to treat a university as business enterprise with faculty as employees and students as customers diminishes its vitality and communal value.

Resort to violence or physical harassment or obstruction is never an acceptable tactic for influencing decisions in a university. This principle does not require actions of property or legality to sustain it. It derives from these considerations:

First, force, harassment, and physical obstruction contradict the essential postulate that the university is dedicated to the search for truth by reason and civility.

Second, resort to such physical coercion leads to a loss of movement and uncontrol-.

Second, resort to such physical coercion leads to a loss of movement and uncontrollability of violence. This is the result of the lowest level of consciousness that began at Columbia with the Naval ROTC demonstration in 1965 and expanded to the clashes of April 30 and May 22. The sequence of steps was predictable: the riot was a factually predictable consequence of these that went before.

The survival—literally the survival—of the free university depends upon the collective and individual resistance of the community to the active and predictable consequence of these that went before.

The survival—literally the survival—of the free university depends upon the collective and individual resistance of the community to the active and predictable consequences of these that went before.