President Robert C. Weaver announced, after the general faculty meeting, that he had appointed thirteen faculty members to fill the vacancies on the Committee of 26. The President said that these members would be appointed temporarily so that they could meet with the students immediately, and that it would be up to the faculty to decide whether or not to make these permanent or not. This move was seen by students as an attempt by the President to do something about the faculty indecision that was evident throughout the day. The thirteen faculty members who were appointed are Professors Berenson, Kweal, Valinsky, Halbert, Manen, LeBarbier, Levinstein, Halboth, Purpura, Frasier, Gayle, Gutman, and Dona.

The Student Coalition of Baruch later made their choices of representatives. The structure of the student choices consists of five students from the Day Session, five from the Evening Session and three from the Graduate Division. Those picked were, from the Day, Tom Swift, Alan Schoenberg, Leon Tandy, Mark Cohen, and Steve Hornberger. From the Evening Session were Stanley Pomerantz, Eamle Pfeil, and Frank Rodgers, Robert Samsel and John Richberg. Graduate students selected were Herb Rothman, Janet Epstein, and Val Cavalier.

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

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

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

Before the recess, however, the Evening Session Student Coalition presented their platform to the faculty, a platform which would result in... (Continued on Page 2)
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be taken up by the Committee of 26. However, they had not decided as to how to choose their delegates, that is, whether they should be elected or appointed. The vote on this matter was 56 for appointment and 58 against leaving the members appointed.

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

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

In a voice packed with emotion, Tom Swift announced to the faculty that when news of their decision would reach the students, he and his representatives would not be able to be responsible for any actions that they might take. Immediately some frightened faculty members got up and screamed that this was a threat and an attempt to blackmail the faculty. Committee of 26 points moved that the meeting be adjourned, and it was, until the next day.

Faculty Indecision

The first reaction that many students had to yesterday's Emergency Faculty Meeting was that it was a poor joke. Petty squabbling over by-laws and the indecision—that was shown on the matter of how they would select their representatives to the Committee of 26 were barely noticed in the near-empty hall where the meeting took place. The consensus was that everyone wanted to leave, and that was it. It was a sign of how much the faculty and students are at odds. After the recess was over and the students returned, President Surry announced that the faculty had reached the following decisions:

1. The faculty would hold another meeting this Wednesday, April 29, 1970.
2. The faculty had decided to have an Alternative committee of 26. However, they had not decided as to how to choose their delegates, that is, whether they should be elected or appointed. The vote on this matter was 56 for appointment and 58 against leaving the members appointed.
3. The faculty announced that it "couldn't, wouldn't and shouldn't give binding authority" to the 26 Committee. They had agreed to give it power to recommend a solution to the faculty, but that was all. By next Friday, according to the consensus, the 26 committee should have recommendations available.

Additionally, the faculty had decided to take up the question of student attendance at faculty meetings. The vote was 58 for attendance and 57 against it. The faculty also decided to release a statement saying that the faculty had reached a decision on the matter.

Copping Out

When it came time for the faculty to vote on how it would select its representatives to the Committee of 26, only 13 members were there. When the meeting started, there were over 200 members in attendance. What happened to the other 100? We don't know the time has come to that there was no excuse for any faculty member to leave that meeting. The Future of Baruch College was being discussed, and for anyone to just fold the books, or having dinner, or getting an outside job was more important than they are operating under a gross misrepresentation. The few days' of any member of the college community is the health of the college. Anything else, barring personal health or safety, comes second. We hope that a report of that disgraceful walk-out will not occur again. If it does, perhaps attendance should be taken, and published, so that the students will know who earns and who doesn't care about them.

50-50

The faculty has voted not to grant binding decision making power to the Committee of 26. While we understand that this has upset many students, we realize that the faculty had good reason for acting as it did.

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

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