

The Foundation of the Hunter College Senate

by Richard Stapleford

Spring 1970 was a period of violent discord on the campus of Hunter College. In protest against the Federal Government's war in Vietnam, racial policies in the United States, and the perceived failure of the College Administration to provide meaningful participation for students in College government, some students took it upon themselves to disrupt the normal order of business at the College. The newly arrived President, Jacqueline Wexler, after consulting with faculty governance committees, decided that the only way to restore order was to ask the police to clear the building of demonstrators. The helmeted armed police patrolling the campus polarized the College, and the school was engulfed in picketing and blockades. Some, believing that their basic right of access to classes was being violated, reacted with rage at the tactics of the protesters. On the other side, those who felt that the gravity of the issues outweighed the needs of the institution to pursue business as usual, engaged in actions that ranged from annoying to actually dangerous. Classes were sporadically suspended and then finally cancelled for the rest of the semester.

Hunter College in 1970 was celebrating its centenary year and had much to be proud of. It had been founded in 1870 in order to provide a liberal education to young women who wished to become teachers. It was first known as the Normal College of the City of New York, "normal" as in école normale, a school for the training of teachers. The founding of the College was part of a master plan for free higher education for all the citizens of New York City. This system, of which the Normal College was an integral part, eventually became the largest municipal system of higher education in the United States. It led to the establishment, in 1961, of

the City University of New York, of which Hunter, City College, Brooklyn College, and Queens College were the founding senior institutions.

The Normal College was intended to provide specialized teacher training but it gradually developed and expanded its curriculum until it became a fully accredited liberal arts college for women. In 1914, its name was changed to Hunter College of the City of New York to honor Thomas Hunter, its first president. Male students were admitted to the previously exclusively female student body beginning in 1964, but its importance to the education of women accounted for its national reputation. By 1970 more American women who had earned Ph.D.'s had received their undergraduate education at Hunter College than at any other institution in the United States. It is no exaggeration to say that in its century of existence no College in the United States had contributed more to the education of women than Hunter College.

Almost from the beginning the school occupied the entire block embraced by Park and Lexington Avenues between 68th and 69th Streets. In 1939 the neo-Gothic structure which had filled most of the Park Avenue block since 1873 was replaced by the still-standing 16-story "international style" structure. The cubical high-rise edifice, with its several entrances, central entrance hall, and bank of ten operator-controlled elevators, was a perfect microcosm of the compressive and channeled character of New York City life. Students entered a small street-level lobby and immediately proceeded via stairways and elevators to upper floor corridors and from there to small classrooms. Because its principal avenues of egress and passage were easily co-opted by small groups, the building itself was to play a role in the Spring 1970 disruptions. By that time student enrollment had risen to the point that the Park Avenue building was severely overtaxed. In the Fall semester of the centennial year 1969-70, the student body numbered 14,130 undergraduate men and women, and just over 5,000 graduates. The faculty consisted of 674 full-time and 665 part-time instructors.

The class that saw their semester of graduation so violently disrupted had entered in September 1966 to a very different Hunter College. One index of that difference is provided by the most burning issue before the students in Spring 1966: the Dress Code Referendum. In March of 1966 the student body completed a questionnaire on whether to change the existing dress code. The Code stated, among other regulations, that neither male nor female students were allowed to wear T shirts, sweatshirts, or dungarees to school. The rule concerning women and slacks is particularly revealing.

Women students are to wear skirts in the Park Avenue building. Between November and March when it is snowing or the temperature is below 25° F they may wear slacks into the building and change into skirts in the locker room. The slacks are to be worn only when coming from the outside door to the locker room and when leaving the building.

The results of the referendum led to a loosening of the Dress Code requirements, but not its abolishment. The paternalistic attitude embodied in this restrictive regulation was a throwback to an earlier period in the College's history. But the fact that its existence occasioned debate, and not simply elimination, reflects the presence in the community of voices in favor of close control of student behavior. The tension between those who sought maintenance of established norms of behavior and those who saw the College as an institution to effect change in society was at the heart of the crisis in the Spring 1970.

The arc subtended by the Dress Code referendum in 1966 and the violent conflicts over war, race, and representative government in 1970 embraces a span of social evolution which might more believably encompass generations. In that five year span Hunter College changed enormously. To anyone familiar with the College today it is difficult to believe that a Hunter student would ever have accepted imposition of a dress code. The effects of the change were, in that sense, beneficial. But the chaos of the Spring semester 1970 created deep

divisions within the Hunter community. Alumni were alienated from an institution which seemed to bear no resemblance to their alma mater. Students were outraged, either that the College authorities were unresponsive to their grievances, or that their access to classes and the fulfillment of degree requirements was compromised. Some faculty members, brought up in a world of academic decorum, felt that the barbarians had breached the gates.

The healing process from the events of Spring of 1970 was due in no small part to the establishment of a new governance system for the College, the Hunter College Senate. In composition and aims it was intended to respond to the concerns which prompted the Spring confrontations and to provide a guide for a newly enlivened College community. In the ensuing twenty-one years since that beginning, the Senate has shepherded the College through periods of imminent danger and stood as an example and symbol of the democratic underpinnings of the community. The steps which led to the creation of the Senate, therefore, are worth retracing as a way of reminding ourselves of our history and our shared values.

Background: The Call for a New College Governance

In May 1969 the Board of Higher Education adopted a statement calling for the restructuring of governance at City University. It asked that each unit of the University create forthwith a Committee on Governance which would be charged with the responsibility to design a governmental system for their unit and to submit the plan for approval by the President of the College and by the faculty and student constituencies.

The Board at this time was itself in the throes of a self-imposed restructuring. The impetus for this institutional remodeling was primarily the rapid growth of the University in the course of the post-war years to the point that it was several times larger than the old Board structure had been designed to govern. But an element of urgency was added to the situation by disturbances on several campuses during the Spring of 1969. The principal grievance of

protesters was the low enrollment of Black and Puerto Rican students in the University as a whole. This translated in the Board's call for new college governances into a statement of position that present college governances failed to allow all members of the community (particularly students) to participate fully in significant policy-making decisions.

Another important element in the call for new college governances was the impending institution of the Open Admissions plan. Under that plan the City University would undertake, beginning in the Fall of 1970, to offer every graduate of a New York City high school a place in some unit of the University commensurate with his or her preparation and abilities. This extraordinary effort was conceived as a direct attack on the principal evils of urban life: racism and poverty. As Albert Bowker, Chancellor of City University said in a speech to New York State Regents in February 1970:

If the people who make up this city are to be brought together -- and they must, else we will have no city -- I can think of no more likely place to begin than on college campuses, especially the college campus eager to adapt to the differences among students, the college with the will to be part of rather than aloof from the problems of the city. We still have de facto segregation in much of our housing in this town, in our primary and high schools, on many of the jobs performed. Beginning next fall we will not have it on our public college campuses.

The campus in the sixties became a locus of conflict and many of us were puzzled that citadels of scholarship and rationality could so quickly come under violent siege. The new generation of college students found us vulnerable in their frustration and their wisdom. Stymied by an economy and political structure apparently indifferent to outrageous social injustice, they chose the university as their target -- perhaps "lever" would be a better word. By moving the university, the generating force in the

"knowledge society," they hope to move society itself. The direction of that movement in the decade ahead will largely be determined by our response.

The stage had been set, then, for a coalition of dissident forces, each with its own agenda but all recognizing that the university could be employed as a lever for social change.

The First Hunter College Governance Plan

In response to the Board of Higher Education call for a new governance structure at each College, in March 1969 Hunter College President Robert Cross held an open Symposium and two "Workshops" to discuss the College's goals and the means to achieve them. At the first general meeting on Wednesday March 19 approximately one thousand members of the Hunter community attended, and in the subsequent workshops that afternoon and the following Sunday about 120 faculty and 200 students and 75 faculty and 55 students, respectively, attended. These workshops generated a number of proposals, some practical, others Utopian. Some suggestions were, in retrospect, a product of the times, while others sought to address problems which are, sadly, still with us today. What follows is a sampling which preserves the flavor of the governance discourse in Spring 1969. (Note that these are only proposals and, except as noted, were not passed by the body.)

1. 50-50 voting power for students and faculty on decision making bodies, including Personnel and Budget and Curriculum committees (carried).
2. Mandatory teacher evaluation by students, to be published each semester prior to registration (carried).
3. That there be established under the auspices of the general faculty body, a student-faculty committee (50-50 vote) to review and reevaluate the system of tenure, and that the committee conduct open hearings (carried).

4. That the Composition of the [governing] body reflect the makeup of the community. For example, a ratio of 7 : 4, student-faculty would be a more democratic representation [than 1 : 1].
5. A CUNY committee should be formed to examine prejudice against women in all areas: what happens to Hunter's women graduates? Can they make it? What do we do about it?
6. We propose decentralization of authority on academic affairs down to a departmental level, where decisions will be made by a body consisting of 50% faculty, 50% student majors. No distinction is to be made regarding faculty status in terms of sitting on and voting in this body.
7. Faculty Council be changed to Faculty-Student Council with equal representation of students and faculty.
8. We recommend that all students be required to take at least one course in race relations. In addition to this, all Education, Sociology, and History majors and minors be required to take a course in comparative cultures.
9. We should open the university doors to all areas. We should have programs for auto-mechanics, plumbers, and craftsmen, as well as for artists, math majors, English, history, and science people.
10. [In order to combat racism] an advisory committee of students should be formed to discuss alleged racial prejudice on the part of any staff member or student. There should be seminars to improve communications between faculty members and students; a course should be offered to sensitize the faculty. Courses in history, economics, education, and sociology should take the Third World into due account.

11. The students should form communes in order to be properly educated, and the university should break its ties to the Board of Higher Education. Hunter could then be run by a Faculty-Student Council in which student power went to the students, faculty power to the faculty.

(from Report of the Symposium and Workshops on Governance at Hunter College, by President Robert Cross and Prof. Serge Hughes, April 8, 1969. See Appendix)

These recommendations provide a glimpse into the nature and temper of the discourse about Hunter College in Spring 1969. A general dissatisfaction with the functioning of the College was felt, both in its mission to adequately educate its students and its role as a catalyst for change in society at large. A sense that important constituencies -- students, staff, the general public -- were not represented in the decision-making process was expressed in recommendations to make the College government as well as the curriculum more representative. Mandatory student evaluation of teachers (a revolutionary idea at the time) was proposed, as well as the establishment of student committees to provide input in tenure decisions. Proposals to amend the course requirements were directed toward eliminating racism and what was perceived as cultural elitism. Sexism in the College was addressed, perhaps for the first time in a College-wide forum.

The central role of President Robert Cross in the formulation of this debate is clear. Recognizing the intensity of feeling in the College community and correctly perceiving the inability of the College governing body, the exclusive Faculty Council, to provide an adequate forum for the interchange of ideas, he called the extraordinary series of meetings. He charged Symposium and Workshops to come forward with proposals which would effectively redress the inequities in the College structure. He announced the establishment of a committee to restructure the College governance, and he promised to see the proposal through the bureaucratic maze at the Board of Higher Education:

A number of the recommendations, if they are to be implemented, involve changes in the By-laws of the Board of Higher Education. I am setting up a special committee on By-law Changes; its duties are:

- a) to conclude which of the recommendations of the Symposium would involve changes in the By-laws.
- b) to determine whether further sounding of faculty or student opinion is desirable, as for instance, by referendum or mail ballot on one or more issues.
- c) to make progress reports to established groups like Student Senate, Faculty Council, Faculty, etc.

The resulting By-laws Changes Committee was chaired by Prof. Joachim Weyl of the Department of Mathematics and Dean of Sciences and Mathematics. Intended to be broadly representative yet small enough to function efficiently, it was composed of six faculty and six students nominated by their respective constituencies, the General Faculty, the Faculty Council, the Student Senate, the SGS Student government, and the Graduate Student Association. The equal representation of faculty and students on the committee, each delegate nominated by the legally constituted governmental organizations of his or her constituency, was a reflection of President Cross's commitment to fostering a truly responsive democratic community. The Committee met at the end of the semester, then reconvened in the Fall semester to pursue its charge. In the meantime, however, Cross had accepted the presidency of Swarthmore College and left Hunter. The Board of Higher Education appointed Dean Weyl as interim president while a search was conducted for a replacement for President Cross. Dean Weyl continued to chair the By-laws Changes Committee under the charge promulgated by the President before he departed.

Up to this point the process of restructuring the governance of Hunter College had been directed by the firm hand of President Cross. It was inclusive in its agendas and efficient in its method. Cross wisely removed the discourse from the established arenas of government in order that even radical opinion should feel the neutrality of the environment. This was not a universally popular move. Some in the community felt that he was inappropriately bypassing the Faculty Council, the College governance organization. Even so, though discussions about the wisdom of his move were often impassioned, the community perceived no hidden goals on the part of the Administration. As a result, most of Hunter saw the governance debate within the College as one in which the goals were widely beneficial and the process was benign.

No discussion of the particular events at Hunter College in 1969, however, should fail to take into account the larger picture in which these events evolved. The war in Vietnam had polarized the country, splitting the public along seemingly unbridgeable faults which threatened to destroy our institutions. Just as protesters were alienated from the Federal Government, students were alienated from college and university administrations. On the national scene, the depth of frustration felt by both the disenfranchised and those who perceived themselves as guardians of our national institutions of law and order was exemplified by the violence of a number of significant clashes in the year preceding.

Television coverage allowed all Americans to participate in the mayhem by providing instantaneous unedited reporting and eliminating temporal and geographical distance. When protesters (mostly college-age) at the 1968 Democratic National Convention in Chicago were beaten by police, television brought immediate and repetitive images of brutality into American living rooms. And when Mayor Daley stumbled in attempting to defend the police action with his astonishing maladroitness of phrase, "The police are not here to create disorder. They are here to preserve disorder," television carried the lapse to the whole country. Closer to home, Columbia University had been the scene of violence, most recently when

students and community activists united to oppose the construction of a new gymnasium at Morningside Heights clashed with police.

Such an atmosphere certainly boded ill for cooperation between administration and reform-minded students and faculty at Hunter. It is to President Cross's credit that he perceived the moment as a crisis in the institution, and therefore he mobilized the entire community to convene as a committee-of-the-whole. Factions previously alienated from the decision making process thus found a neutral environment in which to express their (sometimes extreme) positions. Though the situation was volatile, discourse and exchange prevailed at Hunter instead of the politics of confrontation which threatened to engulf other institutions.

Perhaps for that reason, as well as the wisdom and efforts of its members, in January 1970 the By-law Changes Committee produced a document which outlined a new and democratic government at Hunter College. It called for the establishment of a Hunter College Senate of about 150 members composed of representatives of faculty, students, administration, and facilities support staff. It proposed establishing an independent College Ombudsman to address grievances from all segments of the College community. The principles which guided it in its work are instructive.

1. Lines of authority and communication should be simple and well-defined; responsible bodies and offices should be streamlined to move rapidly and efficiently within purviews of clearly delegated power, as long as the constituencies at large are satisfied with the results.
2. Suitable ways must be provided in which any substantial group of members of the College community who feel that assigned responsibility has not been properly met can legitimately and effectively challenge the responsible agencies.

3. The body in which the general responsibility for establishing policy in educational, communal, and operational matters is vested must be sufficiently large to represent all groups participating in the venture that is Hunter College, and its manner of operations must permit them to feel that they can influence the institution as a matter of both right and responsibility.

(From A Report on the Progress of the Committee on By-law Changes, by F. Joachim Weyl, January 30, 1970.)

The emphasis in these guiding principles is on affording a means for access to government to the widest spectrum of the College community. It seeks to protect the rights of the minority, and it aligns those rights with a concomitant responsibility to oversee policy. Such a radical reshaping of the power structure could not help but arouse anxiety in some corners of the College community.

The Events of Spring 1970: the First Confrontations

Prior to 1970, Hunter College was noteworthy for being a large urban institution which had not experienced serious disruptions. Organized protests about various issues had been, however, an increasingly familiar part of campus life at least since 1967. These usually took the form of small demonstrations by a few students who picketed with placards, or staffed tables to collect signatures on a petition and distribute literature about an issue. The most common subjects were racial injustice, United States involvement in Vietnam, and the issue of student-faculty parity on decision making bodies at the College.

The latter was a particular source of frustration for the fraction of Hunter students actively involved in student politics. The winning slate in the Student Government elections in April 1969 campaigned largely on a platform calling for "50-50" representation on

government committees. The slogan "50-50" was symbolic of a wide frustration felt in many parts of the student body over their lack of access to the real structure of government at Hunter College. The Student Senate was little more than a debating society with, at best, an advisory role on important issues such as curriculum and faculty retention. It had virtually no policy making capacity. The Faculty Council (the College governing body) and the departmental Personnel and Budget committees exercised a complete monopoly on decisions in these areas.

The Faculty Council consisted of about sixty members who were delegated to the body from the individual Departments. It met monthly with an occasional extra meeting to consider special agendas. It was an exclusive group and its meetings were closed to all but the membership. (Even as late as March 30, 1970, with the College teetering on the brink of revolution, a motion to open the meeting on the crisis to the General Faculty was defeated.) The Council was responsible for deciding on all aspects of academic life at Hunter, including curriculum, planning, calendar, etc. Most of its work was thrashed out in one or another of its several committees. Student participation on Faculty Council committees had been increased in revisions to Council by-laws in recent years, but students remained a distinct voting minority within each committee (with the exception of the Committee on Student Rights and Activities which was composed of six faculty members and six students). They were barred, of course, from attendance at or membership in the plenary body itself, and thus were denied the right to actually vote on College policy.

The issue of faculty-student parity in decision making processes might have been resolved within the normal apparatus for negotiating change in the College, except for the intervention of a number of separate events. These events, though unrelated to each other, cumulatively created the atmosphere which resulted in the breakdown of order and the curtailment of the Spring semester. Hindsight in the writing of history is seldom 20-20, so the following list of crucial events is subject to expansion, but there can be no doubt that each of these was of seminal importance: the Nixon administration escalated the bombing of North

Vietnam enlarging opposition to the war; a popular and politically active professor in the Sociology Department, Luis Rodriguez-Abad, was denied reappointment; and, with Pres. Cross' departure, a new president, Jacqueline Wexler, was forced to deal with the crisis.

On the national scene, the bombing was widely viewed as an incremental escalation of the war in Vietnam. It served to enlarge the protest by providing new and repugnant evidence of the inhumanity of the conflict and swaying a portion of previously uncommitted Americans to the side of the anti-war activists. Since it happened over the semester break and during exams, the effect of the bombing on the Hunter community was not specific to the event. It was confined to deepening the sense of alienation of a portion of the student body from the powers of government in Washington and, by extension, at Hunter.

The internal issue of the non-reappointment of Prof. Rodriguez-Abad was directly felt only by the fraction of the student body who were his students, but they were joined by a wide constituency of other students already disenchanted over the issue of the lack of student representation on tenure committees. It did not hurt their cause that Prof. Rodriguez-Abad was a vocal leftist opponent of United States foreign policy whose firing could be seen as an example of the suppression of dissent by government. Petitions and picketing in support of Rodriguez-Abad sprang up around the campus in the Fall and continued when the Spring semester began.

Jacqueline Grennan Wexler was inaugurated in January 1970 as the president of Hunter College . She was an unexpected choice to head an urban campus of 19,000 students in the heart of the most complicated city in the nation. She had previously been president for two years of Webster College, a small Catholic (until 1967) college in St. Louis, Missouri, and before that she had been a Catholic nun for fifteen years. Whichever of her many qualities recommended themselves to the Board when they chose her, President Wexler could hardly have been expected to know the history of the College or intuit the concerns of New York City college

students. Witnesses to those times recall that she radiated goodwill and energy, but that she felt she had to take upon herself full responsibility for controlling events at the College. As a result, the dynamic which had been nurtured by President Cross of displacing authority for College change from a single office to a plenary community body was reversed.

On March 3, a meeting of the SGS (evening session) Student Government hosted by President Wexler in her Conference Room was interrupted by a group of about 150 students and faculty who wanted to know her intentions in the matter of Rodriguez-Abad. She had earlier refused to speak to a rally held in the auditorium in support of the non-reappointed sociology professor. When the President saw the crush of students in her suite of offices she adjourned the SGS meeting and attempted to leave, but was unable to do so because of the crowd. The stalemate was resolved after about fifteen minutes of shouting by the agreement to move the discussion into her Conference Room.

There the discussion continued, revolving around the question of whether the President intended to take any action to investigate the Rodriguez-Abad case. She stood fast on her refusal to act outside of formal channels: "Professor Rodriguez-Abad has not come to me with a formal grievance. You cannot come to me for an open conference until he does so. He has not said that he wishes his case to be made public, and I will not permit any group to use an individual for its own ends" (The Hunter Envoy, March 6, 1970). Prof. Rodriguez-Abad, who was in the room, demurred, however, saying that he was in the process of filing formal complaints against the Sociology Department, and that his case "has in fact been public for nearly a year" (The Hunter Envoy, March 6, 1970).

The March 3 encounter is instructive for a number of reasons. President Wexler was a virtual unknown to everyone at Hunter. Her initial actions, therefore, tended to be seen by everyone as one-dimensional with little shading. She may have fostered this perception by preferring in her speech monolithic statements of principle with a marked emphasis on first

person pronouns. Those who felt that the College needed a strong hand to counter the assault on authority were comforted by her positions. Those who saw the College as needing change began to localize the cause of their discontent on the person and office of the presidency. But neither her supporters nor her detractors doubted the sincerity of her wish to resolve the problem according to her own high standards.

In the course of the succeeding three weeks a number of confrontations and rallies took place centering on several issues, including the Rodriguez-Abad affair, military and industrial recruiting at the College, inequality for SGS students, and student faculty parity on all government committees.

On March 18, approximately thirty-five students and faculty staged a "sleep-in" in the registrar's office to protest the Board of Higher Education proposal to raise the course fees for SGS students from \$73 per course to \$108. The Registrar, Harry Whitehead, remained with the group all night. (He later testified to their "calm and respectful behavior.") The next morning Thursday, March 19, these protestors joined with the Student Mobilization Committee (the anti-war committee at Hunter) who had been engaged in a sit-in in the Career Counseling Office to protest military recruiters on campus. The expanded group proceeded to a rally in the cafeteria sponsored by the People's Coalition. The People's Coalition was a broad-based group of ten student organizations which had banded together to work toward student-faculty parity in government and allied issues. It had been formed during the preceding year but became a well-known entity only at this time. It was to play a central role in the ensuing events.

The elected Day Session Student Government was also involved. The day before, Wednesday, March 18, Student Body President Gail Pressberg had sent a letter to Prof. Walter Eisenberg, Chairman of the Faculty Council, requesting that, at its next meeting, the faculty group take a definite position on the issue of student-faculty parity on policy making bodies at the College.

I ask that at your March 20 meeting Faculty Council take a definite position on the sense of this issue and move to establish a special committee composed of six members of the faculty and six students, to work out a plan for the composition of departmental, divisional, and college-wide Personnel and Budget Committees. I am worried that the faculty do not realize the urgency of this issue and feel that the potential for a confrontation on April 8 [the next scheduled Faculty Council meeting] is too strong to be taken lightly.

(Gail Pressberg to Walter Eisenberg, March 18, 1970. See Appendix)

Just how prophetic Ms. Pressberg's worries were was proven by subsequent events. By April 8 the College had been plunged into almost total anarchy, with blockades, looting, and police action. But neither the Faculty Council Executive Committee nor President Wexler, who received a copy of the letter, grasped the significance of the warning from the Student Government President.

That morning of March 19, then, brought together a broad coalition of student groups responding to more or less specific grievances against the College administration. By afternoon the cafeteria rally had swelled to about one thousand people. At about 2:30 p.m. some 150 students moved upstairs from the cafeteria to institute an elevator takeover. (At that time the main campus consisted of the Park Avenue building alone.) Because of the importance of the elevators to all movement in the sixteen-story high-rise building this act effectively paralyzed the institution. "Small groups of five to seven students prevented the elevator operators from closing the doors by standing in the doorways. The elevator operators left their elevators without incident. One elevator was permitted to run in order to bring down handicapped students who were stranded on the upper floors" (The Hunter Envoy, March 30, 1970).

Informed of the elevator takeover while at home, President Wexler arrived at the school at about 3:00 p.m. After the students refused to move from the elevators into the

Auditorium, she agreed to speak with them in the lobby. At their specific request she assured the assembly that the next day's meeting of the Faculty Council, Friday March 20, would suspend their regular agenda and open the meeting to students so that they could present and discuss their concerns. However she added, "It is absolutely impossible and unfair for me to submit in the name of great groups of people to immediate kinds of demands. I stand on every ethical principle that I have that by September of next year we will have made significant movement toward student input on crucial questions like reappointment, promotion, and tenure" (The Hunter Envoy, March 30, 1970). The President had assumed the high ground of moral authority, and created the impression that she, not the College governing body, was responsible for change within the community. Assured of the opportunity to present their complaints at the Faculty Council meeting, the students lifted the blockade of the elevators. President Wexler then closed the school, cancelling classes for the rest of the day and the next day, the last before Spring break.

However, the scheduled Friday meeting of the Faculty Council, which had been promised to the protesters as a forum to air their concerns, never took place. It was called off at the last minute by its Executive Committee because there had been rumors of a "lock-in," that is a student-enforced locking of the doors while the meeting was in session. The Executive Committee of the Faculty Council demanded guarantees of security from the heads of the three student body governments. The student government leaders naturally refused, since they had neither the power nor the authority to offer such assurances. Three hundred students were already seated in the auditorium when, fifteen minutes before the scheduled start of the meeting, the announcement of the cancellation was made. Thus, a coalition of protesters, who had been promised access to the ruling body of the College, was, in their eyes, betrayed by the Administration. At the last minute and before a one-week vacation break, the promise of a hearing for their grievances was broken. Only the most naive would consider the sequence of events coincidental. Certainly the student protesters did not.

As if to compound the appearance of deviousness, the College administration made use of the one-week Spring break to seek a State Supreme Court injunction against four student leaders and the People's Coalition barring any disruptive acts at the College. The order further prohibited any student from "broadcasting on the campus or streets, use of force or violence, inciting, encouraging or counseling others to do any of these acts" (from the order as quoted in the New York Post, Monday March 30, 1970). The flouting of basic First Amendment rights contained in the language of the injunction exposed the apparent pretense in the administration's dealings with the protesters. To the students, President Wexler could hardly be serious about standing on ethical principles if she sought to legally deny the right of assembly and expression to her own community.

In seeking the injunction President Wexler had acted in conformity with the rules of student conduct of the Board of Higher Education which were revised at the Board's meeting in February and were surely still fresh in her mind.

The Board reserves the right to dismiss or suspend a student, or suspend a student organization for conduct inimical to the best interests of the college or school in which he or she is enrolled which is likely to or does impede, obstruct, or interfere with the orderly and continuous administration and operation of any college, school, or unit of the University in the use of its facilities or in the achievement of its purposes as an educational institution.

(Minutes of Board of Higher Education Meeting, February 24, 1970)

These rules had already been seriously challenged by various segments of the University. Perhaps the most eloquent statement about the dangers inherent in the absolute power of judgement and punishment assumed by the Board is found in a report submitted to the Executive Committee of the University Faculty Senate by Profs. Ezra Shahn of Hunter and

Martin Lean of CUNY. (The Faculty Senate is an elected delegate body representing the faculty of all units of the University and responsible to the Board of Higher Education.)

We find here the recurrence and elevation to By-law status of a phrase with which the Faculty Senate and the Student Advisory Council have taken issue several times during the past year, namely establishing as grounds for dismissal "conduct which is likely to or does impede, obstruct, or interfere with the orderly and continuous administration and operation of any college, school, or unit of the University...." We continue to see this as a serious potential abridgement of First Amendment privileges, and as a possible threat to the exercise of academic freedom.... We feel that the protection of this freedom at an education institution demands, even more so than in the community at large, that risks be taken if need be to assure the full expression of all points of view.... That the concept of orderly operation should become so dominant as to take precedence over expression, and this on the basis of likely results, speaks for itself regarding the health of an academic institution.

(Report to Executive Committee, University Faculty Senate, on Revision to Board of Higher Education By-law XVIII, by Prof. Ezra Shahn and Prof. Martin Lean, March 7, 1970)

The College Returns from Spring Break

The effect of Pres. Wexler's injunction was to galvanize opposition to her administration. The People's Coalition had set a deadline of April 1 (the Wednesday of the first week of classes after vacation) for "detailed consideration" by the President and the faculty Council of their list of twenty-nine "non-negotiable demands" (see Appendix). The demands were a ragged and varied list of proposals that concerned many aspects of college life, including open admissions, tenure, hiring of faculty, curriculum, part-time employment, student government reform and day care. Some proposals, such as the abolition of the tenure system,

were clearly illegal, while others, such as that full-time and part-time faculty be paid on the same scale, simply unworkable. Most of them were well-meaning attempts to democratize the institution. As for the adjective "non-negotiable," it is well to remember that in those days it was ubiquitously attached to all proposals for change from campus political groups. Though it functioned in the popular press as a red flag symbolizing student intransigence, within the university it was never taken literally.

In an attempt to stave off accusations that she had double-crossed the students, the President held an assembly of faculty and students on Wednesday April 1, the day of the People's Coalition deadline. She announced that she would set up a committee to develop suggestions for governance reform which the College would then vote on. She vowed to do everything in her power to implement any reforms approved by a majority of the faculty and student body. The students were not appeased. Remembering the March 20 Faculty Council meeting which had been abruptly cancelled, and faced with an unconstitutional injunction obtained by the administration to prevent them from assembling or organizing, the protesters had no confidence in the President's vow. They began a series of guerilla actions intended to disrupt normal activities.

On Thursday April 2 the elevators were shut down by groups of students. Subsequently many students boycotted classes in order to attend a rally sponsored by the People's Coalition. Fifty students volunteered to continue the takeover of the College by remaining in the building overnight. President Wexler convened an extraordinary meeting of Department Chairpersons, Deans, and the executive committees of the faculty governance organizations to consider the crisis. Supported by faculty and administration leadership, at 10:30 Thursday night President Wexler "asked for police assistance to remove from Hunter College individuals who would not desist from acts which have made any effective functioning of the College impossible for two days" (Statement of President Wexler on the Summoning of Police to Hunter College, April 2, 1970; see Appendix). At 11:00 p.m. Dean of Students Kathryn Hopwood

and People's Coalition leader Eric Fenchel (one of the students named in the injunction) together toured the building to assure that all the students had left. The police arrived at about midnight to verify that the building had been vacated, and by 1:00 a.m. it was locked. The next morning groups of uniformed police were stationed at the entrances to the College, though none were inside the building.

When President Wexler called in the New York City police Hunter College was set on a slippery downward slope toward chaos. Many students now identified the College administration with the helmeted authorities who were seen nightly on the national newscasts putting down protests about the war or racial inequality. Faculty members were deeply shaken to see that familiar image of raw governmental power -- the anonymous armed policeman -- patrolling their academy. To most members of the College community, the police were instruments of blunt force, not given to the exercise of discussion and compromise upon which universities are built.

On Friday when they arrived at the guarded College, faculty members were surprised and shocked. One group gathered spontaneously in the Hunter Playhouse to discuss what they might do about the presence of police in their school. Others, on seeing the phalanx of police, refused to meet classes in an atmosphere of armed coercion and simply turned around and went home. Some certainly supported the President's action.

The police were catalysts. Their very presence caused a hardening of distinctions between the various factions as each member of the community reacted to the intrusion of this alien element into the College. Grey areas allowing for discourse and interchange were replaced by the black and white of absolutist positions. Among the faculty, long-standing friendships and amicable relationships were sundered as Departments divided themselves politically. Where student-faculty interchange continued, it did so in an atmosphere of mutual distrust. Rhetoric became inflamed. The ubiquitous flyers and posters, produced, it

seemed, hourly by the protesters, were filled with outrageous charges and obscene language. Some faculty members were so irate over the language and the calumnies that they took to posting their own angry responses throughout the halls.

In the midst of this alienation and confrontation, President Wexler sought to limit the damage to the community. In a meeting with representatives of the People's Coalition on Monday, April 6 she agreed to establish an ad hoc congress with equal faculty and student representation to propose a new governing structure for the College. But in the public media she tended to personalize the conflict by portraying herself as the target. "I will give blank checks to no one," she proclaimed at a press conference. "I couldn't if I wanted to. I will not resign. They've got to find a way to break me physically" (New York Daily News, April 4, 1970).

She also sought to establish a support base among uninvolved students by calling a meeting on Wednesday, April 8. The group of about 1500 students which gathered to hear her adopted the name The Majority Coalition, a significant reflection of Nixon's and Agnew's "Silent Majority." When the President was informed that about 1500 supporters of the People's Coalition were also present in the auditorium she moved her meeting to the Playhouse which she declared "a safe area" (New York Post, April 9, 1970). This official sanctioning by the Administration of the "us versus them" mentality contributed to the polarization of the College, and the President's adoption of one of the sides reduced her effectiveness as a neutral administrator.

The protesting students had done their part in alienating moderate opinion as well. On April 2, besides blocking the elevators, protesters took over Hunter's switchboard, answering calls with, "Hello, liberated Hunter." On Monday, April 6, and again on Wednesday, April 8, more than one thousand protesters invaded the student and faculty cafeterias, looting whatever food they could get their hands on. During the first two weeks of April demonstrators regularly locked and barricaded all but one entrance to the College and forced the cancelling of

those classes still meeting. Others paraded around the outside of the school chanting "Power to the People" or similar slogans, and blocking traffic on Lexington and Park Avenues. On one occasion a large group of protesters packed into the corridor outside the President's offices on the second floor and, when they were refused entrance, began to pound on the steel door. Physical violence was threatened. The situation was frightening and volatile.

The Establishment of a Negotiating Committee to Resolve the Crisis

On Wednesday night, April 8, the President called the People's Coalition's leaders to a meeting at 10:30 p.m. "She locked us out of her office three times today when we went up to see her and now she wants to see us at 10:30," said one of the student leaders (quoted in New York Post, Thursday, April 9, 1970). They refused to meet with her in private. Rebuffed, she agreed to meet the Coalition in a public forum. At noon on Thursday, April 9, President Wexler suspended the few classes still meeting and, seated on the stage of the auditorium with campus leaders including leaders of the People's Coalition, participated in an assembly with more than 2,000 students and faculty members. She put forward a proposal for resolving the crisis.

Mrs Wexler said at the meeting that she would be willing to suspend classes "for a reasonable length of time," while student demands were negotiated and there was free access to the school.

She called for the creation of a group of students and faculty members to negotiate the demands and to prepare items for a student faculty referendum on ways of making the College a more "humanistic institution," including greater student participation in administration.

Mrs. Wexler said that dissident students had made their point by the disturbances, but that now "we have work to do." She said that many of the demands made by the

People's Coalition. a group of 17 organizations at Hunter, should have been implemented "yesterday" but that she disagreed with the tactics of shutting down the 20,000 student institution.

(New York Times, April 10, 1970)

The Negotiating Committee which President Wexler called for was established from a slate of delegates representing five student organizations and five faculty organizations. Each sent three delegates, so the Committee was composed of thirty voting members. The invited student organizations were the Day Session Senate, the S.G.S. Student Government, the Graduate Student Association, the People's Coalition, and Save Our Schools (a group from within the Majority Coalition). The faculty organizations were the General Faculty, the Faculty Council, the S.G.S. Faculty Council, Concerned Faculty, and the Emergency Faculty Conference (these last two being, respectively, left wing and right wing ad hoc organizations created in the crisis). According to President Wexler the tasks of the Negotiating Committee were to:

1. Resolve the issues in the [People's Coalition] demands that are capable of internal solution.
2. Determine the process for presenting a governance plan to the faculty and student body for referendum and set a date for when that plan will be ready.
3. Develop a plan for class agendas and schedule of classes which will enable the community to understand and debate the issues and to give testimony to the Negotiating and/or Governance Committees.

(Jacqueline Wexler to the College community, April 10, 1970. See Appendix)

President Wexler and the Original By-law Changes Committee

It is appropriate at this point to digress in order to consider the fate of the so-called Committee on By-law Changes which had been established by former President Cross the previous year. The Committee had been composed of six student delegates, nominated from the three student governing bodies, and six faculty, nominated by the executive committees of the General Faculty and the Faculty Council. They had met often during the previous Fall semester and published at least two statements which outlined their thinking and progress. In September, 1969, in reference to the issue of student-faculty parity on decision making bodies, they stated that almost all areas of college governance would benefit from joint faculty-student participation, thus expressing their support of the principle of student-faculty cooperation in governance. (Prof. F. Joachim Weyl to members, Committee on By-law Changes, September 23, 1969).

In a document entitled Concepts for the Restructuring of the Governance of Hunter College dated January 30, 1970 (see above), the Committee put forward a more detailed governance plan. They outlined a plan for a Hunter College Senate to take over the governance of the College. It would be composed of about 150 members including 80 faculty, 50 students, 10 administration, and 10 clerical and facilities support staff. Its committees would include curriculum, instruction, academic standing, and priorities and resources. Each committee would have significant student membership, usually equal to faculty.

When Ms. Wexler became President she disbanded the Cross Committee and shelved its recommendations. At a later point she explained her action. In a memo to the Hunter College community dated April 14, 1970, after her own Negotiating Committee had been meeting for several days, she stated that:

The present committee is derived from the By-law Committee appointed by President Cross. I tabled that committee in late January in order to reconstitute its membership with fuller support of elected constituency groups. Moves toward reconstitution were

seriously impaired by the present crisis. The composition of the Negotiating Committee was my best effort to resolve this aspect of the crisis.

This statement was an attempt to document her efforts at working toward a solution to the governance crisis. Although she stated that she disbanded the Cross Committee in order to establish another committee with fuller support of elected groups, student groups were apparently not privy to her efforts. It will be recalled that she had had clear evidence of the intensity of student feeling about the governance issues. On March 18 the Student Body President, Gail Pressberg, in an exceptional letter, had warned the College administration of the potential among students for a confrontation over the governance issue. In fact, President Wexler's inauguration itself had been interrupted by a student protester who attempted to present his demands about governance to her.

President Wexler's statement that she wished to reconstitute the committee "with fuller support of elected constituency groups," is difficult to understand. The Cross committee had been formed of six student delegates nominated by the three official student government organizations, and six faculty by the executive committees of the General Faculty and the Faculty Council. Who did she consider was left out of this committee which warranted the suspension of its work? One possible way to account for her action in disbanding the Cross committee was that she did not like its creation, a Hunter College Senate which significantly altered the balance of governmental power at the College. Since she was new to the College, it is fair to assume that she was influenced by various advisers within the community, including inevitably those who were part of the prevailing governance system who had the most to lose in a reorganization of government.

A clue to her own agenda is provided by a statement she made to the Negotiating Committee when she appeared before them to clarify her position. In discussing the history of the crisis she stated that, in the beginning, "Faculty Council [had] made substantial

progress and opened the door to reconsideration of governance" (Minutes of Negotiating Committee Meeting, April 20, 1970). In other words, she disbanded the Cross student-faculty committee in favor of a faculty-only Faculty Council committee, while asserting that she sought a plan "with fuller support of elected constituency groups."

An officially delegated committee existed, then, before President Wexler took office, and it had evolved a governance proposal which responded to the main issues advanced by the protesters in the crisis. The irony is that the Senate which was eventually created in 1971 is very close to the one broadly sketched in the Cross committee's January 1970 document. The solution to the governance crisis which precipitated Hunter's violent Spring was immediately at hand. Could the violence have been avoided? Given the complexity of the causes, no one can say. As for the role of the President, Ms. Wexler had every right to inject herself into the debate on governance which was in progress when she arrived and to redirect that debate. But whatever her alternative plan was, it did not create an arena for appropriate academic discourse and exchange of ideas by all members of the College community, and in that essential sense it was a tragic failure.

The Cross Committee attempted to sway the course of events one final time, on April 7, 1970. The campus had already been in turmoil for a week, with blockaded entrances, suspended classes, and police around the building. Five members of the disbanded Committee -- Dean Weyl, Prof. Ezra Shahn, Prof. Kenneth Sherrill, Prof. Bernice Fleiss, and Prof. Bernard Bulkin -- published a proposal for the establishment of a Hunter College Senate.

We are publishing this proposal as a talking document hoping that it will serve to stimulate constructive general discussion and to focus the attention of the community on ways to solve its problems. It appears to us to be responsive to the demands that are currently pressed by many students, and should allay the fears of many faculty that change at this time cannot reasonably be achieved.

The document includes a Preamble which carefully spells out the rights of the members of the College community, including the following statement about students.

The distinctions between faculty and students are neither invidious, discriminatory, nor permanent, and reflect both different functions and different degrees of expertise. Yet the nature of the community is such that it cannot function without a fundamental and continuing agreement as to purpose among its member groups. For this reason students, as one of these groups, deserve and of right should have a significant participatory role in making those decisions which in so many ways affect their daily lives and indeed their future life.

The elegance of language and the expansive spirit expressed in the Preamble testify to the presence at Hunter of a core of committed articulate spokespersons for reasonable discourse. But the hour for such reasoned discourse had passed. When the proposal was put before a meeting of the General Faculty on Wednesday, April 15, in a riot-torn Hunter, it was tied up in parliamentary red tape and replaced by a substitute resolution which included the much weaker statement, "It is the sense of the General Faculty that a new governance document be prepared which acknowledges the validity of identifiable interests that make up the Hunter academic community, and implements the principle of joint decision making, taking into account the different degrees to which these different groups ... should ... participate in various areas." The proposal was too little and too late. A group of about 100 student protesters had gathered in the auditorium to listen to the proceedings piped in from the Playhouse, and when the proposal was passed loud cries of "bullshit!" erupted from the students (The Hunter Envoy, April 17, 1970).

The Negotiating Committee Meetings

On Saturday, April 11, in the siege-like atmosphere of the paralyzed College, the newly constituted Negotiating Committee convened for the first time. Three representatives

each of five faculty groups and five student groups met around a large table in the President's Conference Room (for delegates, see Appendix). After President Wexler opened the session, she reiterated its charge (see Appendix) and the group elected as Chairman Prof. Charles Sherover of the Philosophy Department, a member of the SGS Faculty Council delegation. The Committee passed a series of procedural motions, including that the proceedings be taped and that they be simulcast to monitors outside the meeting room so that the Hunter community could follow the deliberations. Because of the activity of the protesters and the boycott by faculty in the face of the police presence almost no classes continued to meet, but students continued to gather in informal groups at various locations around the College.

The substantive work of the Committee began with a motion proposed by student representative Tom Cusick of the S.O.S. delegation to endorse in principle the formulation of "an academic senate ... to govern this College and that it be composed of 50% students and 50% faculty with equal voting power, and that Faculty Council be abolished." After much discussion the motion was passed with 23 yes votes, 6 nos, and 1 abstention. Eric Fenchel of the SGS Student Government, in the meantime inserted a substitute motion "that every policy making body in this College have 50% student representation and 50% faculty representation (in fact, not in principle)." That motion carried on a vote of 14 yes, 12 no and 4 abstentions. The Committee majority had come down squarely on the side of faculty-student parity on decision making bodies, and on the side of creating a new Hunter College Senate to replace the Faculty Council.

The Committee then proceeded to consider the list of demands which it had assumed as its agenda. This list had begun as the thirty-four demands of the People's Coalition presented as far back as March 19 (see above). It was expanded at this time to include thirteen more, growing out of concerns voiced by various groups in the course of subsequent events. Each of these forty-seven demands were classified into one of three categories: Governance, Internal Demands, or External Demands. The group divided itself into three equal

subcommittees to consider each demand separately before reporting its recommendations to the plenary Committee. The meeting adjourned in the late afternoon.

The next day, Sunday, April 12, the Committee convened at 11:40 a.m. It voted to suspend classes on Monday and Tuesday, April 13 and 14, but to keep the school open. Discussions in classes, it added, "should be directed toward alternate governance plans," and students and faculty were urged to attend debates and discussions to be organized during the course of the day. After dividing into sub-committees for consideration of the multiple demands, the full committee reconvened in the late afternoon. The most significant development at this time was the appearance of a minority position which opposed the Committee's endorsement of the 50/50 issue and sought to have the issue presented to the entire College in a referendum, in spite of the support of the principle within the Committee itself. The motion to call for a referendum was tabled by a vote of 18 to 7. After much further discussion the issue was again put before the Committee and it was again defeated. A stubborn and determined minority set against the student-faculty parity principle had made its appearance. It would be heard from again.

At Monday's full Committee meeting Leda Marks of the SGS Student Government requested that President Wexler be invited to speak to the group. The motion having been approved, the President informed the Committee of the deliberations of the Board of Higher Education Administrative Council. She explained that the Council was in the process of drafting a "sense of the body" concerning student involvement in departmental Personnel and Budget Committee decisions. This "sense" included the statement, "that student input should be achieved by suitable procedures at departmental and college level but without providing for voting membership on the Personnel and Budget committees or their equivalent" (minutes of Negotiating Committee, April 13). The President had presented her position on the issue of student-faculty parity. Sensing that the President's statement was intended to direct the outcome of its deliberations, the Committee moved to consolidate its right, under item two of the original

charge, to present an independent plan for governance to the Hunter College community. On the motion of Eric Fenchel, the Committee voted to reintroduce Prof. David Haight's motion of Saturday stating that "this body shall assume the responsibility for preparing a governance plan for the College to be submitted to a referendum." The vote was 20 in favor, 7 against, and 3 abstentions.

The next day, Tuesday, April 14, the full Committee convened at 8:20 p.m. after a day of sub-committee meetings. Members were acutely aware of their need to complete their work by midnight Tuesday in accordance with their self-imposed deadline, and they worked into the night. The Committee dealt with and passed, often unanimously, most of the forty-seven demands on its agenda. Though all are interesting, for reasons of brevity they will be passed over here in favor of the discussion concerning governance (see Appendix). The sub-committee on governance had spent the day discussing no fewer than six separate plans, including that of the Cross Committee on By-law Changes, without coming to a conclusion. They had been forced to adjourn by the arrival of the hour for the full Committee meeting. At their recommendation, the plenary Committee adopted the principle of separate and independent structures of governance and administration, with governance under the control of a College Senate. As to the question of student representation on Personnel and Budget committees, the Committee passed the following motion 24 yes, 6 no.

Parallel personnel committees [will] be elected, one consisting of five students, the other of five faculty, to decide matters of appointment, reappointment, tenure, and promotion. Provision will be made for systematic, continuing student evaluation of faculty members, the results to be seriously considered by these committees.

The motion, called the Miller-Brandes Resolution after its two framers, Prof. Harry Miller and Student Senator Fred Brandes, went on to outline the procedure to be followed in the event of disagreement between the two parallel committees. These included appeals to an academic

Provost of the College, and then to the Board of Higher Education. The exhausted Committee finally adjourned at 2:30 a.m.

After a one day break, the Committee reconvened on Thursday, April 16. The issue which occupied them for almost the entire five hours was the Miller-Brandes Resolution concerning parallel personnel committees which had been passed at their previous meeting. The motion was called up for reconsideration, and after lengthy discussion and tortuous parliamentary machinations the resolution was defeated by a tie vote of 15 yes and 15 no. A recess was taken, and during the recess those in favor of the Resolution were able to win over one of the "nos" to their side. On returning, a motion was made to reconsider the defeated resolution but it was defeated because a previous "yes" switched to the other side, maintaining the 15 - 15 tie vote.

This was too much for some of the student delegations, and in a fit of frustration they announced that the Committee was not negotiating in good faith. The delegates and alternates of the People's Coalition and the SGS Student Government therefore left the table. The students felt that the Miller-Brandes Resolution establishing parallel personnel committees was already a compromise of their earlier demand for 50-50 student-faculty parity on departmental Personnel and Budget committees. They saw the defeat of the resolution through parliamentary manipulations as a dishonorable attempt to defeat the whole principle of student participation in personnel decisions. As the People's Coalition explained in a press release of April 19, "Through the excessive use of parliamentary procedure, the Task Force remained deadlocked. It was at this point that People's Coalition, recognizing the senior faculty's obvious attempt to thwart possible agreement within the Task Force, walked out." Fatigue and mutual distrust on both sides also played a role in the breakdown of the meeting. Though the meeting ended in disarray over the student walkout, the issues were by no means unsolvable. The Committee had already gone on record as supporting the 50-50 principle.

The meeting of Friday, April 17 opened without the People's Coalition but with the return of the SGS Student delegation. Prof. Sherover presented to the Committee a letter from President Wexler on her view of the present state of the negotiations.

There remain for resolution some critical issues on governance. The Negotiating Committee, functioning also as a Committee on Governance, has met with difficulties that have bogged it down. It is necessary to find a way to break through this barrier in order to move forward. Since as President I am charged with the responsibility of certifying to the Board of Higher Education the process by which a change in government in the College is accomplished, I must insist that the Negotiating Committee show progress towards a resolution of the conflicting issues. It is therefore my decision to pass on to the electorate various alternatives for indication of preferential choice. Since polarization of two alternatives does not move us toward decisions I now propose that any alternative which has 10 votes from the 30 negotiators may appear on the referendum ballot (emphasis original).

(Memorandum from Jacqueline Wexler to the Negotiating Committee, April 17, 1970.

For full text see Appendix.)

The President's directive alarmed the Committee. Even moderate students such as Fred Brandes of the Day Session Student Government felt that the interference was intolerable, and Day Session Students walked out of the negotiations, joining the People's Coalition and the SGS Student Government in their boycott of the proceedings.

Monday, April 20, was the beginning of a three day Passover break for the College, but the Committee reconvened in order to hear President Wexler explain her directive. The People's Coalition continued to boycott the proceedings, but the other student delegations returned to the table. With the President in attendance, a number of faculty and students spoke strongly against the memorandum, stating that it effectively eliminated the necessity of

negotiation and compromise by assuring every minority position that it would have a place on the referendum. A multiple-proposal referendum meant that, in the Committee, the need to bend one's position to reach a common ground became irrelevant. Thus the Committee was changed from one seeking a governance plan reflecting a majority opinion to one simply collating multiple proposals to be put before the College for preferential vote. Some pointed out that the President was illegally subverting her own charge to the Committee, which stated that they were to "determine the process for presenting a governance plan to the faculty and student body for referendum." A minority of faculty and students spoke in support of her action, saying that only a preferential ballot could adequately respond to the multiplicity of opinion in the community.

The President concluded her appearance by stating that the Committee had two, and only two, choices: 1) Present for referendum a plan with minority options, or 2) publicly declare that the Committee is prepared to modify any plan which failed to gain a 60% majority in the plebiscite (see minutes of Negotiating Committee, April 20).

It is clear from the records of the proceedings that coalitions within the Committee had begun to harden, and that the real sticking point for agreement rested upon language. "50-50" was an absolute position for the more radical contingents, and to the more conservative it was no less absolutely impossible to support. Between these extreme positions stood the majority of the Committee, students and faculty who, though they may have had leanings in one direction or the other, had proved themselves ready to debate in good faith toward compromise. The President's directive seemed to many of them to have been inspired not by a fear that the Committee would fail to reach a compromise, but that the compromise they reached would be unacceptable. To the community at large her action was widely interpreted as subverting democratic process toward the end of protecting an entrenched minority. The Day Session Student Senate issued a statement on April 29 lamenting what they termed "the lack of presidential leadership" and including the following analysis of the crisis.

In times of crisis, people look for a leader who will supply a sense of direction which will bring about peaceful resolution to potentially violent issues. At Hunter, during these weeks of disruptions and disorders, Jacqueline Wexler has failed to supply that leadership, nor has she acted as a cohesive force in bringing the different constituencies together. ...

President Wexler's inopportune attempts to supply leadership [to the Negotiating Committee] came much too late to be of use. By issuing new directives to the Negotiating Committee, Mrs. Wexler, in attempting to meet her serious dereliction of duty, appears to the Senate as having submitted to pressure placed upon her by the faculty groups. Mrs. Wexler's directives of April 17 caused negotiations to fall apart. ...

The breakdown in negotiations brought the disenfranchised students to their present position. Their concept that the system never works has been reinforced. They now more than ever see force as the legitimate means of achieving their goals. Rather than dealing with the crisis, President Wexler has helped precipitate it. Her actions have proved the fears of every demonstrator: Wexler is on the other side.

(The Hunter Envoy, May 4, 1970. For full text see Appendix.)

How badly polarized the College had become is illustrated by a comparison of the preceding Student Senate document with the following (somewhat later) statement from an ad hoc group of 100 faculty who strongly supported the President.

We, the undersigned members of the instructional staff of Hunter College, commend President Jacqueline G. Wexler for her extraordinary efforts to deal rationally and sensitively with the extremely difficult situations that have confronted the College during the first five months of her presidency. We applaud and share her determination to work with the members of the Hunter College community to achieve judicious

solutions of our common problems, and urge that she continue and broaden her policy of consultation with the instructional staff on issues of serious concern to us all. While we retain our right and responsibility to oppose decisions that we deem to be ill-advised, we confidently look to President Wexler and the officers of her administration for the courageous and wise leadership vital for the survival of this academic community.

(Statement dated May 22, 1970, forwarded by Prof. Mary Dolciani, Department of Mathematics, and signed by ninety-nine instructors)

The Negotiating Committee met one more time in an effort to fulfill its charge of creating a governance plan. On Thursday, April 23, the Committee, minus the People's Coalition delegates, attempted to agree to dedicate themselves to creating a plan. The meeting was interrupted by a delegation of over 50 students from the Black and Puerto Rican Studies Program who demanded that the Committee act immediately upon the open admissions and SEEK proposals which had been part of the original agenda. Feeling the atmosphere to be threatening and coercive, the Committee hastily adjourned itself.

The Violent Confrontations

The succeeding weeks from April 24 until May 8 comprise a litany of subversive actions on the part of protesters and repressive reaction on the part of the Administration. Reform, to the protesters, was no longer enough, and compromise, to the supporters of the status quo, would have meant surrender to the forces of anarchy. Each side knew only that it wished to humiliate and destroy the opposition. The following chronicle of confrontations scarcely does justice to the atmosphere of anger and frustration which pervaded the College. It will provide, perhaps, a partial record of the kind and intensity of the disruptions within the Hunter community.

Friday, April 24: A group of about 300 CUNY students who had been demonstrating at the Board of Higher Education on 80th Street against a proposal to raise student fees joined Hunter protesters in the auditorium. Some protesters entered the Hunter Bookstore, threw books and other merchandise to the floor and poured glue over the books. The Hunter cafeteria was raided and food was taken and passed out to the protesters. President Wexler called for the police and about 60 helmeted policemen cleared the building. The campus was locked down for the weekend.

Monday, April 27: Students and faculty arrived to find the entrances to the College guarded by police in riot gear. Identification cards were required to enter the building. Seven students, all members of the People's Coalition, were informed by letter that they were suspended for the remainder of the semester. Several departmental offices and the Dean of Students office were ransacked. By the afternoon students and faculty had organized protests, singing and linking arms in the College entrance hall. Police, directed by Administration officials, picked out and arrested eleven students and two faculty members. Tuesday morning's edition of The New York Times carried a front page photograph and article on the police action at Hunter College. At an evening meeting of the Emergency Faculty Conference, a generally conservative faction, President Wexler asked for faculty volunteers to support her action by patrolling the halls together with the police the next day.

Tuesday, April 28: "For the first time in Hunter's history police were permanently stationed inside the campus building to make arrests for assault and vandalism. Faculty, authorized by the President's office, were on hand for cases of 'serious obstruction.' Three young males were arrested, only one a [Hunter] student." (The Hunter Envoy, Monday, May 4, 1970) In the afternoon a group of eight or ten people attacked the Library's main catalogue. Approximately forty trays were pulled from the cabinets, some were smashed, and cards were spilled on the floor.

Wednesday, April, 29: Small fires were started at several places around the school. False fire alarms were set off twice. Protesters marched around the building singing and chanting. When they passed under the windows of the President's office they sang, to the tune of Old MacDonald. "President Wexler had a farm, eei, eei, o. And on this farm she had some pigs, etc." A meeting of the S.O.S. student group in the Playhouse was curtailed when one student, harassed by a demonstrator, had him arrested by the police patrolling the halls.

Thursday, April, 30: There was an attempt to set fire to the inner curtain of the auditorium stage during a People's Coalition meeting. Prof Michael Jaworskyj of the Political Science Department was informed that he had been suspended, in spite of his tenure, by President Wexler "for conduct unbecoming a member of the staff." The incidents which precipitated his suspension took place on April 1 when he was alleged to have pushed a fellow faculty member out of an elevator, on April 9 when he refused to move while blockading a door and spat at Dean Weyl in the confrontation, and on April 27 when he was arrested for blocking the doors while demonstrating against the police presence at Hunter.

Friday, May 1: The Fire Department was called to extinguish a fire in the balcony of the Playhouse. Six or seven seats were destroyed. Police were called because students were knocking on the door of Room 919 where the Faculty Council was meeting. In a College in which few classes were still meeting, the Faculty Council called on the President to re-establish a committee to create a governance plan.

Be it resolved that the Faculty Council urges the President of Hunter College to create a duly representative governance commission charged with preparing for referendum a document for the interval governance of Hunter College.

This document should minimally include items on the membership, powers and basic procedures of a governing body, or bodies, on the administrative organization of the College and the relationship to the governing body, or bodies, on ways in which the

administrative staff shall be required to share planning responsibility with other elements of the College community and on an amendment procedure.

Cambodia, Kent State, and Augusta

Over the weekend of May 2 - 3, the Nixon administration began a massive invasion of Cambodia to destroy staging areas used by Viet Cong guerillas. On Monday May 4 Hunter student protesters were given renewed energy by their outrage at the escalation of the war. Tear gas bombs were set off by protesters on the ninth and fourth floors in two separate incidents. Several people were treated by medical personnel for gas inhalation. An orientation for prospective new freshmen in the auditorium was disrupted by a demonstration by the People's Coalition. False fire alarms were triggered.

The announcement of the invasion of Cambodia occasioned outbursts of anti-war protest across the country, particularly on college campuses. The most significant events took place at Kent State in Ohio.

In the Kent State protest, four students were shot dead by National Guard soldiers and thirteen were wounded. By Tuesday May 5, the shock effect surged through campuses across the country. In the metropolitan area, Columbia and New York University were disrupted by spontaneous sit-ins and demonstrations. Students at Fordham tore down and burned an American flag flying next to the Administration Building. Five hundred Fairleigh Dickinson students marched on the Morristown, New Jersey draft board and staged a sit-in on the town green. Queens College students blocked traffic on the Long Island Expressway creating a massive jam. City College students broke into and ransacked the College ROTC offices. A coalition of about 500 demonstrators marched to the United Nations, smashing windows along the way. "Virtually no college in the metropolitan area remained unaffected as both students and faculty members stayed away in droves. By the end of the day, some administrators were

dubious they could restore classroom schedules. Others formally cancelled instruction for today or through the end of the semester." (The New York Daily News, May 6, 1970)

Many university administrations took formal action to express their solidarity with student protesters. The faculty of New York University Law School voted to suspend classes for the remainder of the semester. Rutgers made class attendance optional. All classes were suspended at Brown. Boston University closed down, and the administration ordered the student body to leave the campus by Thursday at 5 p.m. Even conservative Princeton suspended classes for the remainder of the semester.

At Hunter, on Tuesday morning students rallied at the 68th Street entrance. Four students bandaged with red-stained white gauze lay in the center of the courtyard in dramatic imitation of the four slain Kent State students. The Daily News carried a front page photograph of the solemn tableau in its Wednesday edition. A school-wide meeting had been called for 1:00 p.m. By midday about 250 students had already begun a rally in the main floor lobby, the centerpiece of which was a vigil around the four "slain" students. When the President arrived from upstairs the whole group accompanied her into the auditorium and sat on the stage with her, around the Kent State memorial tableau.

The beginning of the assembly was remarkable, considering the divisiveness that had permeated the campus during the previous weeks. None of the more than 2200 members of the Hunter community who were there will forget it. The President rose to the occasion and spoke eloquently from a prepared text of her shock and anguish at the deaths of the four Kent State students. She announced that she was signatory with thirty-six other college and university presidents to a telegram to President Nixon protesting the war in Southeast Asia. She used the opportunity to clarify her position on legitimate means of protest, affirming that she supported the rights of all to protest issues of conscience.

I have supported -- and strongly support at this time -- the right and indeed the obligation in conscience of persons to strike when they are personally convinced of the necessity and effectiveness of strike. I support students and faculty in any numbers who elect that course of action at this time. I have not supported -- and do not support -- the use of blockade to enforce the conscience or the free movement of others.

(Statement by Jacqueline Wexler to Hunter College Community, May 8, 1970, see Appendix)

An opportunity for the reconciliation of opposing factions at the College seemed to present itself briefly, but it was not seized upon. Prof. Jaworskyj, who had become a symbol of faculty support of the People's Coalition, took the microphone to prolonged applause. Several hundred students simultaneously walked out in protest. He was not kind to the President in his remarks, accusing her of spouting "liberal verbiage" while denying Hunter students basic rights. For her part, when she was asked to lift the suspensions of the seven students who had been suspended by the Administration and to re-instate Prof. Jaworskyj, she refused, saying such action would constitute a mockery of due process. Peace seemed beyond the grasp of all.

Tempers were frayed the next day. Demonstrators blocked the entrances on 68th and 69th Streets. Others, including an estimated 250 Hunter High School students, picketed around the block. An ugly incident occurred when Dean Ruth Weintraub requested police accompaniment to pass through the picket lines into the College. One demonstrator followed her arguing that she should support the Kent State protest. She exchanged harsh words with him. But in accompanying the Dean, the police had re-entered the building, against the President's pledge the day before at the rally that she would not call them unless absolutely necessary. When she was informed that the students were broadcasting that the police were back in the building, the President immediately came down to the College entrance and, using a bull horn, she informed the picketers that classes were to be suspended for the day so that students and

faculty could use the time to plan "moratorium seminars" to be held Thursday and Friday in accordance with the call by the National Student Association for a national student strike. The students cheered the announcement, and, their mission completed, they dispersed for the day.

Classes were suspended at Hunter for the rest of the week. On Friday, May 8, the Faculty Council met and passed the following resolution:

Regular classes are suspended, but Hunter College will remain open and continue its educational mission with full appreciation of the critical issues that face the nation and the universities. Each teacher and his students will remain free to interpret this mission for himself [sic] and the mechanics of grading and course completion shall respect this need for individual options.

"p" [pass] will be an automatic grade unless a "Regular Grade Including Incomplete" is requested by the student and arranged with the instructor or department (up to the end of the next academic year). "Incomplete" may be converted to "p" up to the end of the academic year 1971. ...

Regarding implementation: Instructors are being requested to go their regularly scheduled classes so that they may meet with their individual students to implement the Faculty Council guide lines. Every student is requested to go to the first regularly scheduled class this week for each of his courses.

(Faculty Council Resolution, May 8, 1970. See Appendix)

A flare-up of protest occurred on Tuesday, May 12, when students again blockaded the entrances to the College and invaded the few classes in session to protest the shooting deaths of yet more students in Augusta, Georgia. In solidarity with the protesters, the President closed the school from Tuesday evening until Thursday. "Any other action would have been seen as a racially biased decision," she explained.

I suspended activity and instruction at Hunter College at 5 o'clock this afternoon until Thursday morning. We had attempted throughout the afternoon to communicate to our students in general and to our Black students in particular that we shared in their grief over the violent deaths of Black people in Augusta. ... About 4 o'clock this afternoon a group of students barricaded all entrances to protest what they saw as a lack of general support for the protest against the killing of Black people in comparison to the massive indignation of last week after the Kent State killings.

I therefore suspended educational activity and instruction through tomorrow. Any other action would have been seen as a racially biased decision.

(Statement of Jacqueline Wexler, May 12, 1970)

For all intents and purposes the College semester ended with the Faculty Council resolution to suspend classes for the remainder of the term. Certain activities did continue. Those few classes which continued to meet wound down gradually. The seven suspended students were eventually reinstated after disciplinary hearings before a joint student-faculty court failed to find sufficient cause on the part of the Administration to uphold their suspensions. The arrested students and faculty members pleaded guilty in civil court to disorderly conduct and paid small fines. Proceedings against Prof. Jaworskyj were cancelled after he officially apologized to Dean Weyl for spitting in his face. Prof. Rodriguez-Abad was rehired after President Wexler overrode the Sociology Department's decision to fire him. And commencement, for the class which had entered in 1966 to a lively debate on the College Dress Code, was cancelled.

College Governance and the Outside Negotiator

With her Negotiating Committee defunct, President Wexler set out to create another way to fulfill the Board of Higher Education's mandate to reform the governance at

Hunter College. On Thursday, May 14, she announced to the community that she had engaged the services of Mr. Willoughby Abner from the Division of Mediation of the American Arbitration Association. He was to conduct a series of meetings with representatives from all segments of the College in order to propose to the President a plan for a drafting group for the governance of the College. He was also charged with suggesting guidelines for the conduct of the work of the drafting committee in achieving consensus on all issues of the plan. Mindful of the experience of the precedent Negotiating Committee, she asked him to provide a means for the group to resolve issues on which they did not arrive at a consensus.

Not all segments of the Hunter community supported the move. The S.O.S. student organization, which had participated in the Negotiating Committee and was generally supportive of the President, rejected the appointment outright as an unwarranted intrusion into the College's affairs. The Emergency Faculty Conference felt that the mediator's role was too imprecise, and that all means for resolving the crisis within the College had not yet been exhausted. In fact, an ad hoc committee of faculty had prepared a twelve-page questionnaire on governance to be distributed to the entire community soliciting opinions on various specifics of a new governing body. The idea of the plebiscite questionnaire was at first approved by the President, and she had allocated \$5,000 to the cost of distributing and collating the results. On consultation with the Arbitration Association, however, it was decided that the highest priority must be afforded to the establishment of a new task force, and therefore the questionnaire should be held in abeyance.

Mr. Abner interviewed various members of the Hunter community in separate meetings at Automation House (an off-campus facility) for three weeks beginning Monday, May 18. He seems to have managed to hear most of the principals in the preceding crisis as well as a number of other concerned individuals. His recommendations were submitted to the President at the end of June, and she refined them into a carefully worded Plan for Implementing the Recommendations Regarding the Establishment, Composition, and Operating Guidelines for an

Ad Hoc Committee Charged with Drafting a New Hunter College Governance Plan dated July 27. The plan called for the committee to create a governance plan to submit to the Hunter community by the start of the Fall 1970 term. If it failed to agree on a single plan, elaborate procedures were outlined for resolving deadlocks, including College-wide circulation of a questionnaire, and the creation of a new committee.

The most interesting aspect of the Plan was the composition of the Committee. All the special interest groups which were represented on the Negotiating Committee were also represented on the new Committee, but each group was permitted only one delegate (and one non-voting alternate). Three new constituencies were added: a delegate from the SEEK Program, one from the Hunter Chapter of the American Association of University Professors and one from the part-time instructional staff. Finally, the President would appoint an Administrative Representative and an individual to serve as Committee Moderator. Thus the Committee was to consist of sixteen official members. In the eventual establishment of the Committee membership, the People's Coalition elected not to participate and the part-time faculty position was demoted to that of "resource person" to maintain the relative balance.

Mr. Abner's recommendations concerning membership proved to be astute. The Committee was smaller than its predecessor to enable it to be more focussed and efficient in its discussions. The presence of a single delegate per constituency reduced the tendency toward thinking (and voting) as a bloc and increased bipartisan cooperation. This part of his recommendations proved to be the most valuable, for it worked to the extent that the Committee produced a single governance plan, and all the elaborate contingencies in case of deadlock became unnecessary.

The Creation of the Hunter College Senate Charter

The Task Force (for so it identified itself) was constituted from delegates sent in by the various groups and began meeting on August 12. The effort that its members expended

was, by any measure, Herculean, and they deserve commemoration. The members and alternates were as follows.

Moderator: Mr. Arthur Singer, Vice President of the Sloan Foundation

Students

Day Session Student Government: Gail Pressberg (Bob Pekurny)

SGS Student Government: Naomi Shadowitz (Leda Marks)

Graduate Student Association: Jill Schaeffer (Doris Chee)

S.O.S.: Michael Sandal (David Friedman)

Majority Coalition: Margaret Leahy (Muriel Crawford)

SEEK: Mary Rittenhouse (Carmen Delgado)

Faculty

General Faculty: Ota Reynolds (Mary Dolciani)

Faculty Council: Walter Eisenberg (Evelyn Handler)

SGS Faculty Council: Charles Sherover (James Jervis)

Emergency Faculty Conference: Angelo Santoro (Louis Massa)

Concerned Faculty: Bernard Koser (William Leicht)

AAUP: Robert July (Homer Price)

Administration Representative: Joachim Weyl (James Williams)

Part-time Faculty Resource Person: Robert Hartley

The Task Force continued meeting twice a week and in virtually round-the-clock sessions at a weekend retreat September 12-13. When the semester began Monday, September 14, the plan was not complete but much progress had been made. The group had agreed on three basic issues: 1) That a new college legislative body would be established; 2) That the

government would include the participation of all sessions of the College, including SGS and Graduate; 3) That mandated student judgement would be built into the appraisal of faculty for reappointment, promotion and tenure. By the end of September they had produced and published the Charter For a Governance of Hunter College which became the founding document of the Hunter College Senate.

President Wexler lobbied hard for passage of the Charter. Given the close vote, it is probable that without her efforts it would have been defeated. Her support reflected the change in her position concerning governance since her arrival at the College eight months earlier. The College Senate outlined in the Cross Committee report, which she did not support, was essentially the same as the one proposed by the Task Force, which she strongly supported. Apparently because of the traumatic events of the Spring, the President grew to appreciate the necessity of the full participation of the College community in its own governance in order to avoid the fact or the appearance of autocratic rule. If she is to be held accountable for some of the missteps taken by her administration in the crisis, she must also be credited for her unstinting efforts to create a governance structure designed to prevent similar crises in the future.

According to the rules established by the Board of Higher Education a College-wide referendum was conducted, overseen and certified by the American Arbitration Association. Ballots were mailed out on October 7 to be returned by November 16. The Board of Higher Education stipulated that at least 30% of each constituency had to vote in order for the governance plan to be accepted. Among faculty, 55% voted (64% of the full-time faculty and 31% of the part-time), but among students, only a fraction over 30% voted (see Appendix). So in terms of procedural regulations, the Charter just squeaked through. Of the total 7,178 voting, however, 5,703 voted "yes," a healthy majority of four to one in favor of the plan.

In light of the violence of the Spring semester, the vote at first seems difficult to understand. At least some spill-over of the enthusiasm for reform which animated the

confrontations might have been expected to excite a larger percentage of the plebiscite. But a portion of the non-voters may have been actively expressing their disapproval by refusing to participate, since everyone knew that the proposal would be defeated if fewer than 30% of each constituency voted. Many factions of the community were negative toward the proposal from the start. The Hunter Envoy campaigned against the plan on the grounds that it was developed in secret negotiations, it proposed a Senate that was far too big to be efficient and its lack of a plan for student representation on the Personnel and Budget Committees reflected a continuation of outmoded priorities. The Envoy's editorial position was echoed in various letters to the editor as well as in other student publications. On the other hand a certain amount of support for the Charter emanated from the student arena. Even though only 30% of the student body voted at all, 80% voted in favor of the plan (5,098 yes, 1,244 no).

As for the faculty, the public voices of disapproval represented the position of a significant minority. The Legislative Conference, which was an important faculty bargaining agent, felt that the provision in the Charter for "strong, almost exclusively student-staffed Departmental Committees on the Evaluation of Teaching" went "far beyond what the Conference considers to be an appropriate role for students." (The Legislative Conference Statement of Position on the Proposed Charter for a Governance of Hunter College, October 13, 1970. See Appendix). Two out of three full-time faculty voted, and of those, 70 % voted for the plan (427 yes, 177 no).

The vote was certified by the American Arbitration Association December 7, 1970. Approved by the President of the College, it was then submitted to the Board of Higher Education December 28 for their final approval. The newly-elected Hunter College Senate held its first meeting on Sunday, March 14, 1971, in the Auditorium of Hunter-Bellevue School of Nursing. Its first order of business was to elect officers comprising the Senate Administrative Committee. This consisted of Prof. Louis Massa of the Chemistry Department as Chair, Ms. Doris Chee of the Graduate Student Association as Vice-Chair, and Prof. Charles Sherover of the

Philosophy Department as Secretary. The important position of Parliamentarian was held by Prof. George Nordmeyer of the German Department. The Senate was officially installed by Dr. Frederick Burckhardt, Chairman of the Board of Higher Education, at 4:05 Sunday afternoon, March 14, 1971. The revolution of the Spring semester, 1970, had finally ended.

The Charter

No one on the Task Force expected the Charter to be a perfect governance plan, and this fact is explicit in the provision in the Charter itself that it be systematically re-examined and corrected three years from its adoption (Article II, Section 3). It has, in fact, been amended several times in its twenty year lifetime. At its inception it had many critics. It failed in the eyes of those who wanted the continuation of the closely held control of the College which existed under the Faculty Council. And it failed in the eyes of those who had a vision of a perfect democracy. But what the Charter provides, beyond most expectations, is a working system tailored to the College as an evolving organism.

The system is founded upon certain principles which are implicit or explicit throughout the document. They determine the make-up of the body itself, its committees, the allocation of responsibilities, and the provision for redress of grievances. The most important of these principles is that of representative access (Articles III and IV). The Senate is a legislative body large enough to accommodate the seating of representatives of even tiny fractions of the College community. Yet, by its designations of constituencies, it guarantees a voice to the widest definition of the community. The seventy-six seats reserved to students make that constituency absolutely essential to the operation of government, as it must be. The eighty-eight seats reserved to full-time faculty reflect the more permanent commitment to the College of the instructional staff, many of whom spend their entire working careers at Hunter. The twenty-six seats reserved to the adjunct instructors assures that this important component of the teaching mission of the institution has a significant voice in government.

As the sole governing body of the school in many and varied matters, the Senate permits to every one of its 200 members, without prejudice or hierarchy, equal access to debate and vote on all significant aspects of the institution. It also extends to the entire community at large right of access to its meetings, including the right to be heard (Article VII, Section 2). The Charter assumes to itself the right and the responsibility to safeguard the academic freedom of all members of the Hunter College community (Article II Section 1).

The principle of equality is further implicit in the designation of Senate officers who are to be chosen without reference to rank or status, whether student or professor, full or part-time (Article V). It determines the allocation of membership in the Senate Committees, assuring significant student input as well as professional administrative expertise, in the decisions and recommendations of the committees (Article VIII). The Charter establishes an Evening Session Council to preserve an ongoing consciousness of that important minority in the College (Article IX).

The Charter addresses the inflammatory issue of student input in re-hiring and tenure decisions directly. In conformity with the principle that students have a right to have a significant voice in personnel decisions that affect the quality of their education, it establishes a structure of Departmental Committees on the Evaluation of Teaching (Article XII, Section 3). The Committees are to be composed of student majors and have the authority to use the results of their semester evaluations of each course to help move forward or impede a personnel decision.

The issue of student-faculty parity on Personnel and Budget committees, which had so bedeviled the earlier governance committee and had become a symbol of confrontation, is finessed, therefore, by assigning students sole responsibility for their primary area of expertise and interest, classroom effectiveness. Faculty retain their responsibility to pass judgement on an instructor's professional accomplishments and standing. Today at Hunter College, the

importance of student evaluation in re-hiring, tenure and promotion decisions at the College is beyond discussion.

The principle of individual freedom is paralleled by the independence of the body in its role as the governing institution of the College. It specifies that it shall assume all powers of the dissolved Faculty Council, including, but not confined to, curriculum, academic requirements, College development and instruction (Article II, Section 1). A small provision which has proven to be enormously useful is the statement that "the Senate shall have the right to express itself formally as an advisory body in any area it considers important" (Article II, Section 2).

And finally the Senate provides for the redress of grievances by establishing an office of Ombudsman, chosen from any member of the community. The Ombudsman has the power to conduct investigations and to recommend action to any officer or organization of the College (Article XIII).

The Hunter College Senate Charter grew out of efforts to resolve the complaints of a significant minority at the College. Thus, the Senate itself can be said to have been shaped by the violent confrontations of Spring 1970. Inasmuch as these confrontations were a function of the frustration of the minority in its attempts to receive a hearing, the Charter, with its explicit protection of individual freedom of expression, was an unequivocally positive response to the protesters. It expressly betrays its origins in its safeguards to protect the expression of dissent and to permit the redress of injustices. But in equally significant ways the Charter plotted the future course of the College by providing a blueprint for the creation of a polymorphous system for the prosecution of the College's changing goals and responsibilities. It shares the best features of American representative democracy. And like that national model, it preserves for us, in the essential values built into its articles, the protection we depend on for the enjoyment of our academic freedoms.

Richard Stapleford
Department of Art
Hunter College, C.U.N.Y.
© July 1991