

# COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY SENATE BULLETIN



NO. 1971-1

## REPORT ON THE FIRST TERM OF THE COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY SENATE, 1969-1971

No review of the Senate's first two-year term can begin without considering the circumstances of its creation. I do not refer to the turmoil out of which it was born, but to the intentions and expectations of its founders. These are as diverse as the many groups and individuals who joined in its enactment, but roughly their aims may be summed up as: 1) providing a mechanism for the expression of opinion by members of the University on issues facing it; 2) extending participation in decisions affecting the University as a whole; and 3) settling conflicts through discussion, negotiation, or vote rather than resorting to force or coercion.

A superficial view of the Senate is apt to regard it as simply a peacekeeping body. Even on that limited basis one could say that it has served a purpose in the first term of its life. A more considered view would recognize that peace can be maintained on the campus only if the anxieties and concerns of members of the University are dealt with in a positive and effective way. On this basis the Senate can be considered no more than a partial success, but in the circumstances we have faced even this must be considered an achievement.

The Senate was proposed by faculty members (joined by some student leaders) whose belief in the need for reform in many cases antedated the spring riots of 1968. It was not the idea of the radicals and revolutionaries who occupied buildings in 1968. They did not believe in electoral systems then and have shown by repeated attacks on and disruptions of the Senate that they remain hostile to it as a parliamentary body. It should be news to no one that they think the Senate a failure.

Truthfully, however, one could not claim that any major segment of campus opinion was ever "sold" on the Senate. For those who participated in the referendum establishing it, the Senate was an uncertain venture embarked upon with great reluctance. Most faculty members would have preferred a faculty senate; many spoke contemptuously of having to play political games with students." Administrators had grave reservations about possible interference of legislators in executive matters they know little about. Students were dissatisfied that they did

not have greater representation and that the Senate did not have full power to conduct the affairs of the University. Nevertheless for each of these groups the Senate seemed the only practicable compromise in a situation where no one could expect to gain all that he wanted.

Today, two years later, I believe the progress made in meeting the three expectations above has been sufficient to justify the chance that each group took in ratifying the Senate. The basic problems we face as a university are no less severe. Financially, they are certainly worse. But at least we now have a body in which these problems can be discussed and our real needs faced up to. The business of the University is conducted in the open, the President is subject to interpolation from the floor on any matter, and the demands or proposals of any group or individual can be submitted to discussion and decision.

The level of debate in the Senate has been, on the whole, high. Resounding rhetoric has won few votes. The cogency and earnestness of a single student has sometimes persuaded the whole body. Almost every group or constituency can claim victory on some issues; almost everyone has had the experience of defeat. There is no bloc or faction that has carried everything before it. Hardly a vote has been taken which did not split the several constituencies and find their members on both sides of an issue. There are few members who have not gained respect and affection for their colleagues transcending faculty-student-administration lines. And from this, indeed, has grown a new community, still small, still struggling, but something different from what we have ever known before, and something good for those who have experienced it. Whether it continues to grow in effectiveness will depend, largely, on the continued willingness of able and conscientious individuals to run for and serve in the Senate.

The Senate has met 23 times in the two years of its existence. The average is slightly more than one meeting a month during the academic year with the sessions lasting three to four hours. Considering the generally poor record of faculty and student meetings in bringing things to a vote and maintaining a quorum

until its business has been completed, the record of the Senate is almost astounding. In the year 1970-1971 alone it brought 107 items to a decision. It has rarely failed to complete its agenda. It has never ended a meeting without a quorum. It has survived disruption without yielding itself to rancor and recrimination. It has steadily improved in its parliamentary procedure so that a minimum of time has been lost in wrangling and confusion.

Substantively the actions of the Senate have covered a wide range of matters. The main actions are summarized here under the following general headings: (1) University-wide policies; (2) Matters of University reorganization and development; (3) Conflict resolution; (4) Declarations of principle or protest; and (5) Studies of long-term problems.

#### (1) University-wide policies

- a. "Policy and procedures governing the release of information in response to government subpoenas" designed to protect members of the University from disclosure of confidential information (October 24, 1969).
- b. "Regulation concerning externally funded research and instruction" prohibiting the conduct of research at the University on a restricted or secret basis; and establishing a review board to consider appeals or exceptions. (January 16, 1970; amended February 12, 1971) See Senate Bulletin 1970-1.
- c. Open recruiting policy, assuring equal access to the campus for all groups and agencies, governmental or private, military or civilian, to present opportunities for employment and service to members of the University (October 24, 1969). See Senate Bulletin 1969-2.
- d. Resolutions upholding freedom of expression on campus (March 13, 1970), condemning the use of force and violence on campus (May 15, 1971), and calling on administration to take steps to insure against class disruptions (March 19, 1971).
- e. Resolution upholding the position of the *Columbia Daily Spectator* versus the Internal Revenue Service and affirming its right to publish editorial views on electoral and legislative questions as part of its educational function (January 15, 1971).
- f. Resolution calling on the libraries to abolish indefinite loans of books to faculty members, in order to make the books more widely available to the University community (April 16, 1971).
- g. Resolution establishing University policy to assign space in University buildings "to serve best the totality of purposes and interests of the University" (April 16, 1971).
- h. Resolution affirming the basic importance of undergraduate education within the University and calling for steps to strengthen it (January 15, 1971).
- i. Resolution affirming policy of maintaining appropriate ethnic balance in employment for University construction projects (February 12, 1971).

#### (2) University Reorganization and Development

- a. Resolution calling for the revision of the University Statutes to establish a Graduate School of Arts and Sciences (November 21, 1969).
- b. Establishment of a committee to recommend a permanent structure for the Earl Hall-St. Paul's Chapel Center (November 21, 1969) and unanimous report of that committee (May 14, 1971).
- c. Establishment of Environmental Science Program (March 13, 1970).
- d. Settlement of contested reorganization of the Foreign Student Center according to a plan developed by the Student Affairs Committee of the Senate (March 19, 1970).

- e. Resolution approving revised plans for construction of a new University gymnasium and physical fitness center on north campus.
- f. Initiatives undertaken to assist the *Columbia Forum* to become a self-sustaining publication. (March 19, 1971).

#### (3) Conflict Resolution

Many of the items listed elsewhere in this report were subjects of intense controversy before the conflicts were resolved by Senate action (e.g. the gym question and the Earl Hall situation which were legacies of the spring of 1968.) The Triga-Reactor issue aroused intense feelings among some of Columbia's neighbors and apprehensions within the University. As of this time, the matter has not been resolved by the Atomic Energy Commission, but an Ad Hoc Committee recommended that as far as the University, itself, was concerned, the matter should be decided by the administration on the basis of the educational needs of the University.

Promulgation of the political guidelines by the Administration, as a means of protecting the tax-exempt status of the University, was another potential source of alarm and conflict. Senate debate clarified the issues and the Executive Committee monitored the implementation of the guidelines in order to assure University members that they were not being applied or enforced in a repressive manner.

The Executive Committee, likewise, kept under continuing review potentially difficult problems of employee relations, including pension plans and grievance procedures. As a result of these discussions and suggestions made by members, modifications were made in grievance procedures for nonunion employees (August 5 and September 25, 1970).

In order to air controversial questions Senate Forums were held for discussion of the reorganization of undergraduate education (February 11, 1971) and the role of the University in international affairs (March 15, 1971). A third forum was held in October 1970 as a debate between candidates for the United States Senate from New York.

#### (4) Declarations of principle or protest

Six resolutions were passed by the Senate having to do with controversial questions off-campus: (1) a condemnation of the Vietnam War and provision for a half-day moratorium (September 26, 1969); (2) a protest against American operations in Cambodia and scheduling of a two-day class moratorium (May 4, 1970); (3) Statement deploring high bail set for the Black Panthers (March 13, 1970); (4) Provision for a five-day election recess (October 2, 1970); (5) Request that the Trustees vote the University's stock in the General Motors Corporation with the Project on Corporate Responsibility, chaired by Ralph Nader; and (6) Request that the Trustees abstain on the proposals sponsored by the United Presbyterian Church regarding the activities of the Gulf Oil Corporation in Angola.

#### (5) Studies of long-term problems

The following were subjects of continuing study by Senate committees:

- 1) University budget and academic planning.
- 2) University housing, especially faculty and student housing.
- 3) Status of nontenured faculty.
- 4) Review and reform of calendar.
- 5) Status of women.
- 6) Relationships between Senate and Trustees.
- 7) Investment policy of University (as an outgrowth of the GM and Gulf Oil issues).
- 8) Columbia-Barnard relationship.

- 9) Problems of the University in maintaining independent or private status.
- 10) Funds in support of graduate study and research.
- 11) Urban and ethnic studies.

Many other actions of the Senate concerned its function as successor to the University Council (such as approval of degree programs and calendar changes) or had to do with the internal organization and procedure of the Senate. The promulgation of an elections code, prepared by a subcommittee under Professor Immanuel Wallerstein, is an example of the painstaking but unspectacular work necessary for the effective functioning of a university senate.

The Senate also owes much to its competent staff, Moira Kennedy O'Malley, Nancy Hinman, Sue Howard, Chris Ferguson, and John Fogarty; to many non-members of the Senate who have devoted their time and talents to committee work, to Edwin Schuck as parliamentarian, and to the staff members of WKCR, *Spectator*, and *The University Newsletter*.

Wm. Theodore deBary, Chairman  
Executive Committee, 1969-71

## REPORTS OF STANDING COMMITTEES 1969-1971

### Educational Policy Committee

The present environment of change and uncertainty, together with the extraordinary diversity of educational activities carried on at Columbia, have given the Educational Policy Committee perhaps the widest-ranging and most variable assignment of any Senate committee save the Executive Committee. We have been called to work on approval of attendance certificates in minor programs—and on the future of undergraduate education at Columbia; on the details of internal administrative organization in the Foreign Student Center—and on a new direction with Barnard College; on the problem of secret agents on campus—and on the elimination of the Theatre Arts Program and the establishment of a new School of National Studies. And we have been called upon to act in the various capacities of advisory body, policy-making body, investigative agency, sounding board, court of appeals, and burial ground for issues of only momentary significance.

The present era of selective university contraction generates substantial segment of the committee's work, having to do with the elimination or curtailment of certain educational programs. In order to avoid pre-empting the authority of faculties and deans, provide opportunity for the affected officers of instruction and of administration to develop agreeable courses of action, and to keep itself ready for independent review of decisions made, the committee has generally avoided involvement in the substantive issues of a proposed curtailment so long as these were under consideration within the faculties involved.

In the case of the Linguistics Department, the committee proposed no action on or independent exploration of the substantive issues, while keeping carefully informed about the state of discussions among the Dean of the Graduate School and the committees of instruction and faculties concerned. The circumstances of the elimination of the Theatre Arts Program of the School of the Arts, on the other hand, clearly demonstrated the need for improved consultation and communication between the committee and the central administration. Our committee's recommendations touching both principles and procedures, are stated on pages 4 and 5 of the committee's May 14 report to the Senate.

How the committee might make a systematic contribution to educational policy, as against *ad hoc* action on items externally referred to it, was a question frequently raised among the members. A major committee initiative was to identify alternatives and develop information and thought in advance of action to change the relationships among Columbia College, Barnard College, and the School of General Studies. As a more systematic approach to educational policy, the committee established a standing subcommittee on academic planning for the purposes of:

- a. keeping the committee and the Senate informed about planning activities in the various schools and divisions of the University and in the central administration; and
- b. assisting the committee and the central administration in developing academic planning criteria responsive to University-wide needs.

### Budget Review Committee

The Budget Review Committee produced two reports during the last academic year. The first was a review of the 1970-1971 budget submitted October 2, 1970. This 22-page report analyzed the budget in terms of the stated priorities of the administration and what the committee felt were other implicit priorities, especially expanded administration. These questions were debated at the November 6, 1970, meeting of the Senate. The second report was a preliminary one on the changes impending in budget-making procedure and policy which were then being instituted for the 1971-1972 budget. This detailed analysis, submitted February 11, 1971, was the basis of a full debate in the Senate in which the administration clarified its intentions on many points (see minutes of February 26, 1971, meeting). In addition, the committee submitted to the Senate a resolution dealing with the publication of past tuition rates in the University catalogs. The subject of tuition and various forms of locked tuition were actively on the committee's agenda during the year.

### Committee on Physical Development

1. **Educational and Physical Planning.** It is frequently said that physical planning for the University—especially the construction of a long-range master plan—cannot be undertaken until the University has constructed a long-range educational plan. We do not fully accept this premise, partly because we doubt that a complex University can easily develop a stable master plan encompassing all of its educational programs. To delay the development of physical planning until the University has worked out its educational plans is, therefore, impossible.

It is our view that physical planning for the University must begin by assaying the principal deficiencies of our present physical plant, given our present educational programs, then ask simultaneously two questions: (1) How will prospective changes in educational programs alter our physical requirements? (2) Do the present limitations of our plant, coupled to the present and foreseeable shortage of funds, require a modification of our present educational programs? The first of these two questions is, of course, the more important. In some instances, however, the physical requirements of a particular program may be so expensive as to require a hard look at the program itself.

2. **Relocation.** From time to time it has been suggested that the University abandon its present campus on Morningside Heights and build new facilities removed from the city. The committee has considered this possibility and reached the nearly unanimous view that no such relocation is possible. The cost of replicating our present plant, even with its defects, would be prohibitive. Furthermore, many of our faculty and students come to Columbia precisely because it is in New York.

The committee did consider a more modest proposal that certain divisions of the University be moved to peripheral locations. We do not recommend against this option, but we find it difficult to choose a likely candidate. Each of the arts and sciences departments serves two or more undergraduate divisions, as well as its graduate students. Faculty would be compelled to divide their time between two locations, and students would be forced to travel in order to take certain courses. The programs of certain professional schools are more nearly autonomous. But our largest professional schools—Business, Law, and Engineering—are well housed on the Morningside campus and in buildings constructed with gifts and grants for their particular purposes. It has been difficult enough to use small parts of those buildings for other

purposes. It would be even more difficult to use them entirely for other purposes. On balance, we do not believe that much can be gained by pursuing this option.

3. **The Academic Plant.** The principal academic buildings on the Morningside campus can be divided naturally into two groups: (1) The original McKim, Mead, and White buildings, many of which are now nearly 70 years old; and (2) four large buildings constructed within the last dozen years (Uris, Mudd, Law, and International Affairs). Some of the McKim, Mead, and White buildings have been partially or completely renovated within recent memory. These include Journalism, Dodge, Lewisohn, Mathematics, the Chandler Laboratories, and Kent. Others, however, have not received significant attention for a great many years. We believe that this task should have high priority, with special attention to the quality of classrooms.

Although we assign high priority to the systematic renovation of our older buildings, we concur in the administration's public declaration that new science facilities are the greatest current need and hence have the highest priority on the academic side. The committee has not reached a conclusion concerning Mr. Pei's proposal to construct a large life sciences tower. Subject to further analysis, it is our tentative recommendation that fund raising for academic construction seek first to satisfy the needs of the science departments, but that the process of renovation to which we have referred be started promptly and carried to conclusion as rapidly as possible.

4. **Housing.** The quality, style, quantity, and cost of student housing has been a matter of deep concern to this committee and to others. At the same time, we know that there is too little housing available for faculty and staff, especially for those in junior ranks who cannot afford high rents. To complicate matters, the University is asked to help supply housing for other residents of the community and has a dual obligation to do so; in years past, University expansion was partly responsible for reducing the stock of housing on Morningside Heights, and in the years ahead, Columbia's own interests require that the quality of life in the area around it be sustained.

We have been much impressed by the University's efforts to combine various forms of financing to build on the pharmacy site. These efforts, we believe, must be continued to a successful conclusion. We suggest, however, that the administration organize a special task force to review thoroughly all aspects of student housing and that this task force include members of the Senate Committees on Physical Development and Student Affairs. That task force should look to ways of financing new housing for students at reasonable rents (including the possibility of a contribution from the University itself or the solicitation of new gifts, even in competition with other projects). It must also confront a difficult problem which we have not yet stressed—how to build student housing without displacing other residents of the community.

#### **The Committee on Faculty Affairs, Academic Freedom, and Tenure**

During the academic year 1970-1971 the committee spent much time drafting a code of academic freedom and tenure, which it submitted to the April meeting of the Senate. Although debated at the May meeting of the Senate, action was postponed until the fall. The code seeks to embody best practice within the University with respect to appointment, reappointment, promotion, and retirement, and to specify procedures in cases of dismissal of faculty or termination through discontinuance of a unit. The committee is currently elaborating two companion documents which will also be submitted to the Senate: a statement on professional ethics and academic discipline, and a set of guidelines for the governance of University departments. When these three statements have been completed and approved by the Senate, it will be possible to issue a revised and up-to-date version of the *Faculty Handbook*.

In April the committee reported to the Senate on salaries and workloads of nontenured faculty in response to the

Holtzman resolution of December 12, 1969. In May it reported on the activities of its subcommittee on faculty housing (Professor Benjamin P. Dailey, chairman). Members of the Faculty Affairs Committee, or its chairman, were consulted informally on several occasions by faculty members with grievances or by the Administration on personnel problems, but no case reached the point of formal action by the committee (as happened twice in 1969-1970).

During the 1971-1972 Senate session, the committee expects to devote considerable time to assisting the administration in rewriting the now out-of-date 1968 edition of the *Faculty Handbook*. It anticipates that substantial further effort will be needed to perfect policies for the allocation to faculty of University housing (especially in the light of recent and prospective changes in the law) and to elaborate procedures for implementing such policies. The committee will continue to stand ready to mediate grievances and expects, in case of need, to oversee the operation of the dismissal procedures recommended in its code of academic freedom and tenure.

#### **The Housing Subcommittee of the Faculty Affairs Committee**

The subcommittee was established in November 1970, some eighteen months after the dissolution of the old Housing Committee of the University Council. Its members: Harold Barger, George Bond, Benjamin Dailey (chairman), Sigmund Diamond, Morton Rennert, Herschel Webb. It has met seven times.

An important initial task has been to reconsider and revise the priority system, based on the accumulation of points, for allocation of the more desirable university-owned apartments. The subcommittee accepts that for compelling reasons apartments will sometimes have to be allocated outside the "points system." It believes an essential task is to develop and implement a clear-cut policy for such exceptions. Such a policy must be mutually agreeable to the Vice President and to the subcommittee, and of course intelligible to the Housing Office. The task of defining such a policy has proved unexpectedly difficult and is not yet completed.

The committee has investigated several instances of serious disagreement between faculty tenants and the Housing Office. It has agreed to play a role as mediator in future disputes of this kind brought to its attention either by the director of the Housing Office or the faculty member involved.

In addition the committee has discussed problems affecting housing, such as the policy for subleasing; problems of crime and security; policy toward tenants who were, but no longer are, connected with Columbia; and housing priority for Barnard and Teachers College personnel.

Administrative officers, librarians, and research personnel, if full-time employees of the University, are awarded the points appropriate to the faculty levels to which their salaries correspond. However, the deans of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, of Columbia College, and of the School of General Studies receive special consideration because of their need of space in which to entertain.

The subcommittee has agreed that the Vice President may make exceptions to the "points system" on the following grounds, and the Vice President has agreed to report all such exceptions promptly to the chairman of the subcommittee: (1) for persons newly appointed to the Columbia faculty who do not already have housing in the city or within commuting range (recently this group has absorbed most of the apartments that have become available); (2) in extreme cases to retain the services of especially valuable faculty (this group is not numerous); (3) for reasons of compassion (such cases are rare).

#### **Student Affairs Committee**

The committee took up the following main problems among the many brought to its attention:

1. **Tuition increases.** With education costs rising so rapidly, there was considerable concern about tuition increases, especially after a definite \$200 hike was announced for next year.

Thus, the committee appointed two members to meet with the Tuition Increases Subcommittee of the Budget Review Committee. Upon recommendation of this subcommittee, the Senate passed a resolution regarding publication of tuition increases.

2. SAHI and the Columbia Health Service. A special committee of students and administrators studying the student accident and health insurance plan and the Columbia Health Service reported to the committee in March. Because of overpricing by the present insurance company for Columbia students, this committee had investigated a number of other companies and asked Student Affairs to express a preference, based on material distributed concerning the investigations. The committee was of the opinion that the Home Insurance Company is best suited to the needs of most students, and this company will be used in the coming year.

3. Foreign Student Center. At the March 19 Senate meeting the committee presented its resolution on the Foreign Student Center. After more than a month of consultations with President McGill and with staff and students at the Center, the committee succeeded in getting the administration to reconsider its proposal to dismantle the Foreign Student Center and adopt the alternative plan which makes comparable savings while still maintaining the counseling, social, and admission services in the Foreign Student Center.

4. Coed Housing. One of the first matters of concern this year was coed housing. Our first meeting consisted of a hearing on existing plans, which the committee learned were quite vague. Jane Moorman, assistant to Barnard's President and Blanche Lawton, Director of Residence at Barnard, revealed that serious considerations were only in the very beginning stages. Since that meeting several proposals on various coed arrangements have been presented from different segments of the University.

5. Resolution on Housing. In December the committee proposed that a special committee of the Senate be created to work on the housing problem. The Executive Committee rejected the proposal on the grounds that several committees were already concerned with various aspects of housing; Mr. Holtzman suggested that a subcommittee of Student Affairs could deal with the problem much more efficiently than a special committee of the Senate could. As a result, Stan Stein began to explore the possibilities of renovating Ruggles Hall. Plans seemed to be moving along well when they reached Mr. Telfer's office, at which point the committee was unable to learn what their future would be.

6. Political Activity. On September 25, 1970, President McGill issued the guidelines on political activity, which stated, "Wide participation in the political campaigns for this autumn's congressional elections makes it necessary to provide some guidance to members of the University about the lines of action that must be observed in order for the University to retain tax-exempt status under the United States Internal Revenue Code and comply with other applicable federal and state laws." Due to the fact that many partisan political groups on campus felt their existence to be threatened, Alvin Bluthman drafted a resolution providing an alternative method of organization for them which would not conflict with the guidelines. The draft was sent to both University Counsel and the Legal Committee of the Senate for comments. At this time the committee has received no response, but it is expected that next year's committee will carry the project to completion in order that it might be available for the 1972 elections.

7. Student Trustees. With some reservations about the chances of passage by the Senate, the committee voted unanimously in December to support the Lehn-Lorton resolution requesting that the Board of Trustees elect two students (one undergraduate and one graduate or professional) to serve as Trustees. The Senate referred the resolution to the Executive Committee, which created a "subcommittee to explore the whole range of issues involving the representation of other sections of the University on the Board of Trustees and

[resolved] that the Trustees be asked if they wish to participate." At this writing two joint meetings have been held, and others are planned.

8. Student Activities. At the suggestion of the Director of Student Interests, Philip Benson, the committee held a hearing to explore the possibilities of centralization and coordination of student activities. Representatives from Ferris Booth Hall, McIntosh Center, the Foreign Student Center, and Earl Hall explained their registration procedures, available facilities, funding, and participation. The committee found that procedures differed substantially and that in some cases various funding restrictions and other policies placed limitation on membership, etc. The committee urges that its successor continue to study these practices and formulate some proposals on how they could be handled more efficiently and equitably.

Recommendations for next year:

- a) Creation of a subcommittee on a student bill of rights
- b) Continuation of the study on extracurricular activities and centers
- c) Completion of resolution on political activity
- d) Re-establishment of a college student council
- e) Consideration of questionnaire in registration material

#### Committee on External Relations And Research Policy

The initial working concern of the committee was the status of the regulation on external relations. An amendment designed to meet constitutional objections was prepared and adopted by the Senate. The regulation (without substantive changes) is now incorporated into the University Statutes. As a result of its study of the possible working effects of the regulation, the committee became concerned that arrangements which do not violate the rules might nonetheless raise serious issues of academic values and standards. It recommended that this problem and related issues be considered during the next session of the Senate.

The committee also considered problems of fund raising in terms of a) evaluation of present practices and b) the consideration of new and possibly innovative funding arrangements between the government and universities which might be exploited on behalf of Columbia. The subcommittee on present external funding procedures was led to propose improved communication between administration and faculty as a means of better exploiting present sources of funds. Copies of the subcommittee's report are available. Considerations of problems of funding were further broadened by a letter from Professor de Bary in which he invited committee consideration of both 1) the balance between private and public funding in a "private" university and 2) the fundamental question, "Is a 'private' or 'independent' university a viable concept in the present circumstances . . ." The committee concluded that such questions should be considered probably by a joint educational policy-external relations committee at a future session. Furthermore, during discussions of funding, competitive needs, etc. the question of University priorities constantly recurred. These must be defined to prevent gross and distorting excess while avoiding trespass on academic freedom of inquiry. This dynamic problem demands further committee consideration.

A subcommittee was appointed to consider the problems of graduate student financing. Unfortunately, swift changes have made it difficult to evaluate the present situation and continued study is recommended. The External Relations Committee also established a standing subcommittee on grant and contract administration as a liaison group with the administration. Its mandate: to explore ways of improving communications between directors, principal investigators, and the administration and to consider means of resolving common problems.

#### Committee on Community Relations

The Committee on Community Relations has given much attention to defining the committee's role and its relation to

the other offices, committees, and individuals working in this area. There is The Office of Public Affairs (including community relations), a presidential adviser on community relations, a recently formed Trustees committee on community relations, and an *ad hoc* committee appointed by the President on the specific problem of community relations in regard to the pharmacy site. The committee this year requested that the administration inform us, as far as possible, of activities and plans that will have an impact on the community before public announcements are made. As a result of this already improved communication, the committee will be in a better position to fulfill its function. It would also seem desirable that this committee meet with the newly formed Trustees committee at least once each year and as the need arises.

Recognizing the importance of insuring fair employment practices in University building projects, the committee appointed a subcommittee to make a recommendation to the Senate to insure "maximum feasible ethnic balance" in future construction. Our resolution, brought to the Senate in connection with the Physical Development Committee's proposal to build a new gymnasium, was accepted by the Senate only in part. We also recommended that the facilities of the new gymnasium be shared with neighborhood groups.

The committee felt that its usefulness as an intermediary in disputes between "the University" (as represented by the administration) and "the community" (as represented by whoever comes forward) was demonstrated by the meetings it sponsored between community groups and President McGill to discuss the future use of the pharmacy site. These meetings offered an opportunity for an exchange of views; while basic disagreements were not resolved, each side seemed to gain an appreciation of the other side's point of view, tensions were relieved, the chance of confrontation bred of simple misunderstanding was reduced, and the opportunity for rational dialogue was presented.

Although some members of the committees, especially the student members, feel strongly that the committee should take a more active role in the community, we have reluctantly agreed that we do not, at this time, have the resources, in time or money, to mount an effective program. The committee discussed, last year and this, the possibility of a store-front neighborhood information center. A subcommittee submitted a proposal that was accepted by the committee but which was not submitted to the Senate because the expense involved would seem to be prohibitive at this time.

The committee commends President McGill for his informed awareness of the need for improving the University's relationship with the community and to thank him for the generous gift of his time to the committee.

#### Rules Committee

The Rules Committee, chaired by Mr. Philip Benson, has spent all of its time formulating a set of permanent rules of conduct for the entire University. The committee has submitted its final draft of regulations and procedures to the new Rules Committee for review and acceptance.

#### Alumni Relations Committee

Under the chairmanship of Donald MacLaren, alumni senator, the committee met a number of times during the year to discuss possible activities and programs. As a result, a special commission, composed of alumni representatives from selected schools within the corporation as well as Barnard, was formed which has subcommittee status under the parent committee. This commission will study the operations and structure of the over-all University alumni organization. This group will examine, in the broadest sense, the alumni picture on a University-wide basis and make recommendations to the University Senate via the Senate Committee on Alumni Relations concerning the ideal organization of these activities. The commission held meetings throughout the summer of 1971 and will present a preliminary report in the fall of 1971.

#### Committee on Honors and Prizes

Over the past two years the Committee on Honors and Prizes has taken the initiative in seeking out original and distinguished candidates for honorary degrees and prizes in accordance with the procedures outlined in the By-Laws of the University Senate. In view of the confidential nature of the consultations within the committee and with the Trustees, it is inappropriate to enter into the specific details of the committee's nominations.

The committee also made recommendations to the Trustees concerning the award of the emeritus standing to retiring professors and concerned itself with the various policies which will determine the award of the newly established Hinrichsen Prize in Music. The committee received and accepted the judgment of their various colleagues concerning the award of several University awards in accordance with procedures previously established by this Committee and the various committees which direct the administration of these prizes.

#### Committee on Libraries

The Libraries Committee, chaired by Professor William E. Leuchtenburg, explored both broad questions of library policy and more focussed issues on which decisions had to be made. The committee also profited from reports of the Director of Libraries, Warren Haas, on some of the issues with which he is concerned—the establishment of priorities, the impact of automation, the budget, physical development, and the relationship of the Libraries to the profession and the national government. Such administrative problems have been discussed as the use of the Libraries by non-Columbia people, problems of security, and plans for air conditioning the Butler stacks. After a favorable recommendation by the committee, the Director went ahead with plans to join the Center for Research Libraries.

Another area in which the committee worked was that of extended loans. A subcommittee was formed (1) first to establish the fact that violations were too numerous, and (2) after many studies, hearings, and attempted solutions, to propose a resolution recommending that extended loans no longer be made for indefinite periods. The Senate adopted the resolution, and the University Libraries defined the maximum length of loans as being six months from the date of borrowing. Other areas discussed by the committee were the deputy borrowing system and stack access.

Next year's Libraries Committee may want to review the progress that has been made in such enterprises as the new faculty loan policy, physical development, stack access, acquisition programs, and general academic and budgetary questions.

#### Committee on Senate Structure and Operations

The Committee on Senate Structure and Operations has been concerned with the distribution of representation among the various components of the University, elections and the right to vote, the committees of the Senate and the way in which they are functioning, and rules of procedure on the floor. A number of other questions were handled during the year 1970-1971; each of these led to a legislative proposal and the adoption of legislation by the Senate as a whole.

- (a) A unanimous consent procedure for minor matters laid before the Educational Policy Committee as successor to the old University Council. (These relate chiefly to changes in degree programs or the addition or elimination of such programs.)
- (b) The inclusion of two additional seats on the Community Relations Committee to be filled by an alumnus and a member of the administrative staff.
- (c) A provision in the Senate Rules of Procedure for a roll-call vote.
- (d) The formal adoption of the provisional elections code first proposed in the spring of 1970.

- (e) A revision of the Senate's rules of procedure to conform (except in the case of rules which have a particular application to the Senate) to Robert's Rules of Order. (A further practical change was the presiding officer's appointment of a parliamentarian.)
- (f) Clarification of the status of Presidential appointees to the Senate.
- (g) A recommendation to the Executive Committee which resulted in legislation affecting the continuance of Senate committees during the summer.
- (h) A provision in the elections code to secure voting rights to nontenured faculty.

The major matters with which the committee sought to deal in the course of the year were requests for additional representation and proposals to secure a greater continuity in the functioning of the Senate. The principal change that could be effected through legislation was a change in the times of election and terms of office. It was proposed that there be two elections each year, one in the fall and one in the spring. To secure a greater measure of continuity it was suggested that terms expire in May and that the new Senators be elected as of May 20 each year. This provides a chance to reorganize the Senate every two years without deferring the election of a new Executive Committee until the autumn. (The proposed changes have been adopted by the Senate and forwarded to the Trustees for amendment of the Statutes.)

The demands for additional representation offered a thornier problem. The most pressing demand came from Barnard College. The committee proposed that a Barnard seat be added at the expense of the student delegation from the Columbia Corporation, although a number of members felt that the requisite seat (if the number of senators was to remain at 100) ought to come from the school most loosely tied to the Columbia Corporation, Union Theological Seminary. The question of depriving Union of a right to a seat—no matter how infrequently occupied—without any negotiations, weighed heavily in some minds. In the end both alternatives were proposed in the Senate and both failed to attain the necessary three-fifths vote.

## CHRONOLOGY OF SENATE ACTIONS 1969-1971

May 28, 1969. Amended By-laws to state that Chairman of the Executive Committee shall be nominated and elected from among its tenured faculty by the Senate as a whole.

September 26, 1969. Passed resolution allowing the University community to observe October 15 Moratorium on Vietnam War without penalty or prejudice.

October 24, 1969. Adopted basic principles and procedures for release of information by the University in response to governmental subpoenas. . . . Adopted policy of open recruiting on the campus by outside agencies.

October 31, 1969. Meeting with deans and department chairmen for discussion only (not a business meeting). . . . Discussed proposed establishment of Graduate School of Arts and Sciences preparatory to action taken at November 21 meeting.

November 21, 1969. Passed resolution to restructure and change name of Graduate Faculties to Graduate School of Arts and Sciences and request revision of Statutes to that effect.

December 12, 1969. Adopted ruling that students from affiliated institutions are eligible to serve on Senate committees on same terms as other persons who are non-senators. . . . Passed resolution establishing interim administrative board to formulate arrangements for a permanent structure and organization of the Center for Religion and Life and to oversee operations of the Center until a permanent board was formed. . . . Passed resolution requesting that a joint subcommittee of Faculty Affairs and Educational Policy Committees study the status of nontenured faculty.

January 16, 1970. Adopted regulation concerning externally funded research and instruction to aid in the protection of freedom of inquiry and instruction in the University community and to preclude most or all University research which requires secrecy. Procedures for approval of exceptions to the rules were included in the regulation. . . . Heard representatives of Students' Afro-American Society report on drug addiction in Morningside community and agreed to help their detoxification program as much as possible.

February 13, 1970. Heard report of Presidential Search Committee which recommended the selection of Dr. William J. McGill. . . . Passed substitute motion on Center for Religion and Life to create a separate Senate committee to recommend long-term basic policies and to leave the President free to deal with administrative problems. . . . Passed resolution reaffirming Columbia's adherence to principles of intellectual freedom and free speech for all, regardless of the nature of their views.

March 13, 1970. Passed amendment to By-Laws to allow speaking privileges for Senate committee members who are not Senators. . . . Asked External Relations Committee to make a study of the sources and means of distribution of funds in support of graduate study and research. . . . Established a committee to develop additional mechanisms for the exchange of ideas and to provide for open forums. . . . Disapproved resolution to contribute University monies to the Black Panther Party Bail Fund and passed resolution deploring all attacks upon lawful expression of opinion and calling on the University administration and public law officials to protect these rights.

April 17, 1970. Passed amendment to Sections 31, 33, and 34 of the University Statutes concerning voting rights and membership of nontenured faculty and students in faculties and administrative boards. . . . Asked Trustees to vote their shares of common stock in General Motors Corporation in support of Project for Corporate Responsibility proposals. . . . Passed resolution in support of nation-wide April 22, 1970 Environmental Teach-In.

May 15, 1970. Adopted rules of procedure to implement externally funded research and instruction regulation (as passed January 15, 1970). . . . Passed resolution which allows students in undergraduate divisions of the University to receive credit toward a graduate degree for courses taken at any time in excess of undergraduate requirements. . . . Passed resolution condemning use of force and violence by any individual or group on a university campus or elsewhere.

October 2, 1970. Passed election day intermission from October 30, 1970 through November 2, 1970.

November 6, 1970. Changed By-Laws to include one representative of administrative staff on Community Relations Committee. . . . Passed resolution directing the Executive Committee to monitor the administration's enforcement of the *Guidelines on Political Activity*.

December 11, 1970. Adopted Senate elections code. . . . Changed By-Laws to include one representative of alumni on Community Relations Committee. . . . Passed unanimous consent procedure for use of Educational Policy Committee in regard to routine disposal of matters involving degree requirements, etc. . . . Adopted record vote procedure calling for signed ballots on demand of one-third of Senate members voting and present. . . . Tabled resolution condemning actions of the administration to abolish Theatre Arts division and approved resolution calling for investigation by the Educational Policy Committee of the administration's plans concerning School of the Arts. . . . Tabled resolution calling for unrestricted admission to disciplinary tribunals and reaffirmed power of the JCDA to limit attendance to 25 without impairing the principle that tribunals are open to the public.

January 15, 1971. Received reports of the Joint Committee on the Triga-Mark II Nuclear Reactor and asked the administration to decide the matter of the reactor in light of the normal questions of budgetary demands and academic needs. . . . Passed resolution on role of the University in politics

asking the Executive Committee to invite discussion by the University community of the relationship of campus political activity to the educational process . . . Referred to Educational Policy Committee a resolution endorsing the importance of undergraduate education and asking the graduate and professional schools to review their contributions to the endeavor . . . Passed resolution endorsing *Spectator's* decision to test a recent IRS decision concerning tax-exempt status of campus newspapers which support candidates for public office or attempt to influence legislation . . . Appointed subcommittee to study representation of other sections of the University on the Trustees'.

February 12, 1971. Established review board to consider possible exceptions to the regulation concerning externally funded research and instruction to be appointed by the President with the advice and consent of the Senate . . . Passed resolution urging appropriate University offices to give advance notice to admissions applicants of prospective tuition increases . . . Received preliminary report of the Budget Committee and scheduled full-dress discussion for February 26 . . . Passed resolution endorsing administration's efforts to proceed with proposed renovation of existing gymnasium facilities and construction of additional facilities . . . Passed resolution calling on the University to assure maximum feasible ethnic balance in employment for gymnasium construction . . . Passed resolution which provides that the University continue to make its recreational facilities broadly available to the Morningside community.

February 26, 1971. Meeting with deans and department chairmen (not a business meeting) . . . Discussed preliminary report of the Budget Committee and the response of the Administration to questions concerning implicit budget priorities.

March 19, 1971. Passed resolution condemning classroom disruptions . . . Passed resolution concerning proposed dismantling of the Foreign Student Center which asked the administration to reconsider its proposed action and to consider an alternate plan of the Student Affairs Committee

which would maintain social, counseling, and admissions services . . . Passed resolution asking that serious efforts by the administration, magazine staff, and others to develop self-sustaining financial basis for Columbia Forum be continued and encouraged.

April 16, 1971. Asked Executive Committee to study question of secret agents on campus and make such recommendations as the nature of the problem might require . . . Passed resolution providing for two regular Senate elections each year and term of office to expire on the second May 20th following election or appointment . . . Adopted amendment to elections code which assures that the right to vote in all constituencies is enjoyed by nontenured as well as tenured faculty . . . Disapproved amendment to By-Laws to grant voting seat to one Barnard student at the expense of the voting seat presently held by Union Theological Seminary tenured faculty, since three-fifths vote necessary to amend was not achieved . . . Established committee to study relationship between Barnard and Columbia . . . Passed resolution recommending to Director of University Libraries abolition of indefinite loan periods for library materials . . . Disapproved resolution calling on University to cast its proxy votes at Gulf Oil shareholders meeting in favor of four proxy resolutions sponsored by the Southern Africa Task Force of the United Presbyterian Church and passed substitute motion calling on the University to abstain on four proxy resolutions as stated above . . . Adopted general principle on space allocation that all assignment of space in University buildings be made by the central administration in the best interests of the University.

May 14, 1971. Passed resolution reaffirming University policy of making its recreational facilities broadly available to members of the community so long as their use by members of the University community is not curtailed and undue budgetary burdens are not imposed . . . Declared its commitment to encourage the development of day-care facilities for members of the University community and its neighbors and asked the administration to explore possible locations within the University complex which might be converted into day-care centers.

## MEMBERS OF SENATE AND SENATE COMMITTEES 1969-1971

NAME	TERM	COMMITTEE(S)		
Anderson, James (Lib. School)	5/69-6/71	Libraries, Stu. Aff.	Davis, Robert Gorham (G.S.)	5/69-6/71 Ed. Pol.
Anderson, Quentin (College)	5/69-6/71	Ed. Pol., Struc.	deBary, Wm. Theodore (Phil.)	5/69-6/71 Exec., Budget, Struc.
Anderson, Ray (Admin. Staff)	5/69-6/71	Phys. Dev.	Dolan, Andrew (Law)	5/69-6/70 Struc.
Ausubel Herman (G.S.)	5/69-6/71	Fac. Aff., Rules	Dowdy, Edward (Soc. Work)	5/69-6/70 Com. Rel., Stu. Aff.
Barger, Harold (Pol. Sci.)	5/69-6/71	Fac. Aff., Budget, Housing	Eilenberg, Samuel (Pure Sci.)	5/69-1/71 Ext. Rel.
Bauke, Joseph (Phil.)	10/70-6/71	Rules	Eisenstadt, Steven (G.S.)	5/69-6/71 Ed. Pol.
Baxter, Annette (Barnard)	10/70-6/71	Fac. Aff.	Ellis, Katherine (College)	12/69-6/71 Struc.
Beeson, Jack (G.S.)	9/69-12/69	Rules	Erlanger, Bernard (Pure Sci.)	3/71-6/71
Bellack, Arno (T.C.)	9/69-6/70	Hon. & Pr.	Erskine, Kenneth (Soc. Work)	5/69-9/69 Exec.
Bennett, John (Union)	9/69-6/70	Hon. & Pr.	Evans, Luther (Lib. Staff)	5/69-6/71 Libraries, Phys. Dev.
Berg, Ivar (Bus. School)	5/69-9/69	Exec.	Farnsworth, E. Alan (Law)	5/69-6/70 Budget, Exec.
Blanchard, Jean-Marc (College)	9/69-6/70	Ext. Rel.	Ferrar, Harold (G.S.)	5/69-6/71 Fac. Aff., Hon. & Pr.
Bonilla, Charles (Engin.)	5/69-6/71	Al. Rel., Phys. Dev.	Finegold, Barbara* (T.C.)	9/70-2/71 Phys. Dev., Stu. Aff.
Bouhafa, Faris (College)	5/69-4/70	Exec.	Fitch, James (Archit.)	5/69-6/71 Phys. Dev.
Brady, Gerald (Bus. School)	10/70-6/71	Phys. Dev.	Forde, Kenneth (Medicine)	5/69-6/71 Com. Rel.
Breslow, Ronald (College)	5/69-6/71	Exec., Budget	Fox, William (Int. Affairs)	5/69-6/70 Exec., Rules
Brown, Courtney (Bus. School)	10/69-6/71	Phys. Dev.	Fraenkel, George K. (Admin.)	5/69-6/71 Struc., Hon. & Pr.
Brown, Warren (Jour.)	9/69-6/70	Com. Rel.	Fraiman, Nelson (Engin.)	5/69-6/71 Budget, Libraries, Phys. Dev.
Cain, Edward A. (Dental)	5/69-6/71	Fac. Aff., Rules	Frankel, Charles (College)	5/69-2/71 Ed. Pol.
Caraley, Demetrios (Barnard)	5/69-6/71	Struc.	Frazier, Shervert (Medicine)	5/69-6/70 Libraries
Carrillo, Emilio (College)	9/70-6/71	Stu. Aff., Al. Rel.	Friendly, Fred (Jour.)	5/69-6/71 Exec., Struc., Forum
Carter, Sidney (Medicine)	9/70-6/71	Structure	Futter, Victor (Alumni)	5/69-6/71 Al. Rel., Inv. Pol.
Chargaff, Erwin (Pure Sci.)	5/69-6/70	Ext. Rel.	Goodell, Warren (Admin.)	5/69-6/71 Phys. Dev.
Clark, Robin (Medicine)	5/69-6/70	Rules, Com. Rel.	Gralnick, Samuel (Engin.)	5/69-6/71 Ext. Rel.
Cohen, Lawrence (Engin.)	5/69-6/71	Budget	Gray, John (T.C.)	10/70-6/71 Ed. Pol.
Coleman, Samuel (College)	5/69-9/69	Exec.	Grosser, Charles (Soc. Work)	5/69-6/70 Com. Rel.
Cordier, Andrew (Admin.)	5/69-6/70	Exec.	Guttmacher, Sally (Pol. Sci.)	5/69-6/71 Exec., Al. Rel.
Cremin, Lawrence (T.C.)	5/69-6/70	Fac. Aff.	Haack, Robert (Bus. School)	2/70-6/70 Budget
Damrosch, Douglas (Medicine)	5/69-6/71	Exec., Ext. Rel.	Hance, William (Int. Affairs)	10/70-6/71 Phys. Dev.
			Hassialis, Menelaos (Engin.)	5/69-6/71 Ed. Pol., Exec., Inv. Pol.
			Held, Julius (Barnard)	5/69-6/70 Phys. Dev.



Gleason, Martin  
 Goodman, DeWitt  
 Greenawalt, Robert K.  
 Greenburg, Jack  
 Haas, Warren  
 Halford, Ralph  
 Halsband, Robert  
 Henkin, Louis  
 Hiestand, Dale  
 Hofstadter, Richard  
 Hohenberg, John  
 Hyman, Paula  
 James, Stanley  
 Johansson, Margit  
 Jones, James  
 Kay, Marshall  
 Kimball, Arthur  
 Kleinfeld, Ira  
 Komarovsky, Mirra  
 Kristeller, Paul  
 Kuhn, Deanna  
 Leichter, Hope  
 Levene, Howard  
 Lythcott, George  
 McGoey, Thomas  
 Merton, Robert  
 Mikelson, Peter  
 Miller, Robert  
 Morgan, Councilman

Com. Rel.  
 Ext. Rel.  
 Fac. Aff.  
 Com. Rel.  
 Libraries  
 Ext. Rel.  
 Hon. & Pr.  
 Ext. Rel.  
 Com. Rel.  
 Hon. & Pr.  
 Hon. & Pr.  
 Hon. & Pr.  
 Ext. Rel.  
 Ext. Rel.  
 Rules  
 Hon. & Pr.  
 Al. Rel.  
 Hon. & Pr.  
 Fac. Aff.  
 Hon. & Pr.  
 Rules  
 Com. Rel.  
 Fac. Aff.  
 Com. Rel.  
 Com. Rel.  
 Fac. Aff.  
 Ed. Pol.  
 Hon. & Pr.  
 Ed. Pol.

Moss, Antoinette  
 Mount, Ellis  
 Nielsen, Fred  
 Oliver, Jack  
 Owens, Garland  
 Potter, Charles  
 Rao, Krishna  
 Reeder, Dennis  
 Salgo, Peter  
 Schaefer, Patricia  
 Schless, Howard  
 Shoup, Carl  
 Sidorsky, David  
 Skinner, Elliott  
 Smith, Walter  
 Solinger, Alan  
 Stein, Stanley  
 Stoia, Alex  
 Taggart, John  
 Talwani, Manik  
 Taussig, Robert  
 Telfer, John  
 Wallerstein, Immanuel  
 Way, Peter  
 Webb, Hershel  
 Wechsler, Harold  
 Wright, Christopher  
 Wright, Ernest  
 Zell, Lee

Stu. Aff.  
 Libraries  
 Com. Rel.  
 Ext. Rel.  
 Fac. Aff.  
 Libraries  
 Hon. & Pr.  
 Stu. Aff.  
 Forum  
 Rules  
 Structure  
 Hon. & Pr.  
 Com. Rel.  
 Fac. Aff., Rules  
 Al. Rel.  
 Stu. Aff.  
 Stu. Aff.  
 Ext. Rel.  
 Hon. & Pr.  
 Ext. Rel.  
 Ext. Rel.  
 Phys. Dev.  
 Struc.  
 Stu. Aff.  
 Housing  
 Rules  
 Ext. Rel.  
 Com. Rel.  
 Al. Rel.