GFCSA Rejects Presidential Comm Report; Student-Faculty Reform Now Up to Gallagher

By HENRY J. STERN

After five months of consideration, the General Faculty Committee on Student Activities has completely rejected the proposals submitted to it by the Presidential Committee on Student-Faculty Relations, President Gallagher announced Thursday. The Presidential Committee had recommended the abolition of the Student-Faculty Committee on Student Activities and the Student Faculty Fee Committee. GFCSA is the parent body of both.

The GFCSA submitted its report to President Gallagher on January 25. Established by President Gallagher in March 1953, after Student Council was declared dead but "no assured time" as a spokesman told BHE representa tors in that spring, his sporting events ran overtime, his "luggage had been cancelled by the BHE because of cuts and cancellations of one of its allotted time to present commercial programs."

The program, which was scheduled from 5 to 5:30 PM Saturdays on WABD, was a joint operation of the General Faculty Committee on Student Faculty Relations and the General Faculty Committee on Student Activities. It asked that a new group would have faculty members and five students, with voting terms. Faculty members of GFCSA are made up of four professors, three members of the Department of Student Life, and two administrators.

President Gallagher, Senior Class President, Harry R. Pollak, stated in a letter sent to the network on March 16, and did not go on the air until 5:30 PM tomorrow. Notice of the cancellation of the program was made on the radio, "Panorama," was a Sunday-night program of which the station donated the time. The sport events ran overtime, the original allotted time for the series was reduced accordingly.

Dr. Cartonnas, who organized the "Panorama" production, has represented the series reduced according to the original allotted time for the series was reduced accordingly.

Dr. Cavaill, who said that each "Panorama" program had represented about six weeks of preparation and that faculty members, students, often canceled other engagements to appear on the telecasts. He said that after a Du Mont spokesman told BHE representatives on February 6 that there could be "no assured time" for the program, the executive committee of the BHE decided to withdraw it.

Tourney... City College will participate in the 1954 National Intercol lege Bridge Tournament. Eight pairs will make up the team to represent the College, and these will be determined at an Intra-College Tournament to be held at House Plan, 6:30 PM tomorrow.
The (Presidential) Committee report provides that final authority for the conduct of such activi­
ties rest for all practical purposes with the students through their
duly-elected representatives to
the Student Council. To this end
proposes the elimination of the
present SFCSA in the uptown
day center. This Committee, com­
posed equally of students and
faculty, is basically charged with the
general responsibility of evalu­
ing proposals for action by any
student group in the light of their possible effect on the general wel­
fare of the College. As a particu­
lar function of this responsi­
bility, SFCSA must approve chart­
ers prepared by student organi­
sations seeking formal recogni­
tion on campus. These charters,
under present practice, reach the
Committee only after they have the endorsement of the Student Council. And finally, the Com­
mittee enters into any individ­
ual or group member of the
College community appeals against the resolves or actions of
student organisations.

SFCSA Replaced
The report proposes to replace
SFCSA by an Appeals Board, which shall be limited to the func­
tion implied in its name.

The composition of the Ap­
peals Board is in many ways similar to that of the Committee
it replaces. The effect of this pro­
posal is essentially then to limit the jurisdiction of the student­
cadet committee to the consid­
eration of grievances which may arise from the measures adopted or approved by the Student Coun­
cil. It would leave the right to legislate with that duly constitu­
ted legislative body.

We recognize the merit of this
proposal. It serves to create a procedure for student govern­
ment within the College, which

reflects in great part the demo­
cratic process of government un­
der which we live outside its walls. Under this analogy, the Student Council is in the nature of the Federal Congress with full power to legislate, and the Ap­
peals Board is in the nature of the Supreme Court, which merely passes on the legality or ethics of such legislation when conflict arises. The analogy is not com­
plete under this proposal, to be sure. There is no provision in the College process for the role that the executive branch plays in our national government.

BHE Power
But our concern is more funda­
mentally with the analogy itself. The democratic process under
which the College is administered is by no means modeled on the democratic process of our nation­
government. Few resolves of any College committee, the fac­
ulty, or administrative officers, may be considered final without
the approval of the Board of Higher Education. Even such mat­
ters as staff appointments and curricular changes must be sub­
mitted to the Board of Higher
Education for final consideration. Obviously the Board does not
question the competence of those
who initially decide on these mat­
ters, but it reviews them pre­
sumably from the viewpoint of
the general welfare of the Institu­
tion.

Under the proposal of the re­
port, student government, could enact any positive provision by a higher authority concerned
with college welfare. Such power would not be limited in this Insti­
tution. It would be more unquali­
fied than any power possessed by the faculty or administration of
the College, which is nevertheless, in our opinion, retains the
democratic institutions in the course. And thereby it would open a wide gap in the adminis­
tative safeguards elaborated
the Board of Higher Education.

Faculty Responsibility
The second significant differ­
ence the students might have to face, is being virtually concerned with the pro­
cess of student activity on the well known fee basis. This concern is de­

tailed in the report’s provision for the effect of the elimination of
SFCSA and its replacement with an Internal College Governing body. It reflects in great part the dem­
ocratic process under which the College is administered.

The democratic process, as follows, is not modelled on the
American government. Few resolves of any College committee, the fac­
ulty, or administrative officers, may be considered final without
the approval of the Board of Higher Education. Even such mat­
ters as staff appointments and curricular changes must be sub­
mitted to the Board of Higher
Education for final consideration. Obviously the Board does not
question the competence of those
who initially decide on these mat­
ters, but it reviews them pre­
sumably from the viewpoint of
the general welfare of the Institu­
tion.

Under the proposal of the re­
port, student government, could enact any positive provision by a higher authority concerned
with college welfare. Such power would not be limited in this Insti­
tution. It would be more unquali­
fied than any power possessed by the faculty or administration of
the College, which is nevertheless, in our opinion, retains the
democratic institutions in the course. And thereby it would open a wide gap in the adminis­
tative safeguards elaborated
the Board of Higher Education.

Faculty Responsibility
The second significant differ­
ce the students might have to face, is being virtually concerned with the process of student activity on the well known fee basis. This concern is de­
tailed in the report’s provision for the effect of the elimination of
SFCSA and its replacement with an Internal College Governing body. It reflects in great part the dem­
cratic process under which the College is administered.

The democratic process, as follows, is not modelled on the
American government. Few resolves of any College committee, the fac­
ulty, or administrative officers, may be considered final without
the approval of the Board of Higher Education. Even such mat­
ters as staff appointments and curricular changes must be sub­
mitted to the Board of Higher
Education for final consideration. Obviously the Board does not
question the competence of those
who initially decide on these mat­
ters, but it reviews them pre­
sumably from the viewpoint of
the general welfare of the Institu­
tion.

Under the proposal of the re­
port, student government, could enact any positive provision by a higher authority concerned
with college welfare. Such power would not be limited in this Insti­
tution. It would be more unquali­
fied than any power possessed by the faculty or administration of
the College, which is nevertheless, in our opinion, retains the
democratic institutions in the course. And thereby it would open a wide gap in the adminis­
tative safeguards elaborated
the Board of Higher Education.

Faculty Responsibility
The second significant differ­
ce the students might have to face, is being virtually concerned with the process of student activity on the well known fee basis. This concern is de­
tailed in the report’s provision for the effect of the elimination of
SFCSA and its replacement with an Internal College Governing body. It reflects in great part the dem­
cratic process under which the College is administered.

The democratic process, as follows, is not modelled on the
American government. Few resolves of any College committee, the fac­
ulty, or administrative officers, may be considered final without
the approval of the Board of Higher Education. Even such mat­
ters as staff appointments and curricular changes must be sub­
mitted to the Board of Higher
Education for final consideration. Obviously the Board does not
question the competence of those
who initially decide on these mat­
ters, but it reviews them pre­
sumably from the viewpoint of
the general welfare of the Institu­
tion.

Under the proposal of the re­
port, student government, could enact any positive provision by a higher authority concerned
with college welfare. Such power would not be limited in this Insti­
tution. It would be more unquali­
fied than any power possessed by the faculty or administration of
the College, which is nevertheless, in our opinion, retains the
democratic institutions in the course. And thereby it would open a wide gap in the adminis­
tative safeguards elaborated
the Board of Higher Education.
Presidential Committee Report

As a result of its deliberations and discussions, the Committee has come to the following conclusions:

1. It was possible to survey the opinion of students concerning self-government. It is the belief of the Committee that student relations: the relations of the Student Council (SC) to the Student Faculty Committee (SFCSA) and the Student-Faculty Fee Committee (SFFC) are an important part of student life. The Committee is of the opinion that these committees should be continued and the continuing education of these committees should be continued.

2. It was possible to survey the opinion of faculty members serving in indefinite terms and five students serving for one term and chosen partly from groups such as the student newspaper, the Technology Inter-fraternity Council, the Interfraternity Council, Student House etc. Though arms of the General Faculty Committee on Student Affairs (SFFC) have taken action on their own initiative, the faculty has been active in the activities of the department of Student Life, the action of committees, the activities of the College as a whole. The faculty, therefore, feels that the faculty's power to regulate student activities, SFFC passes automatically on all fees; SFCSA may review all SC actions as well as take action on their own initiative or at the request of the Department of Student Life and other groups. Almost all of the testimony before us has indicated that students and faculty members on the two committees have been in substantial agreement on most issues, and the SFSC and the SC fee Committee have almost never been at odds. Present student-faculty committees have undoubtedly served a useful educational purpose.

3. The Committee feels, however, that the primary responsibility for governing students should rest with the students. The Committee believes, primarily as advisors, that students should be allowed to conduct their own affairs under a set of laws approved by the faculty, subject only to necessary checks where the basic welfare of the college is involved. At present, though this principle is often followed in practice, SFFC has an automatic power of review which limits the power of student Council to that of recommendation. Further SFFC can take action without recourse to Student Council; this constitutes a serious limitation of student self-government. It is the feeling of having no effective power rather than specific action of SFCSA or SFSCS that has led to student dissatisfaction. Faculty members should act, the Committee believes, primarily as advisors to head off trouble before it arises. Student-Faculty committees should be committees of last appeal only.

4. The Committee, therefore, recommends the substitution of the following for the present machinery.

(a) Student Council shall have the power to initiate action in all cases where the welfare of the student is involved. The Student Council or its Fee Committee shall be empowered to allocate fee funds. The Student Council and its Fee Committee shall both act under a set of laws approved by the SC by-laws and approved by the faculty. This set of principles shall be formulated by the SC selected at the next regular election specifically as a constitution making body, charged with the responsibility of drawing up a constitution after holding open hearings on the question.

Faculty committee to advise

(b) There shall be a faculty committee of three to act as a Board of Advisers. SC shall nominate six faculty members to serve on this Board, three of whom shall be chosen by the President to serve on the first Board of Advisers for three years, two years the year respectively. There shall be a yearly rotation of one member. The Board may review all SC actions as well as take action on their own initiative or at the request of the Department of Student Life and other groups. Almost all of the testimony before us had indicated that students and faculty members on the two committees have been in substantial agreement on most issues, and the SFSC and the SC fee Committee have almost never been at odds. Present student-faculty committees have undoubtedly served a useful educational purpose.

Conduct their own affairs

(3) The Committee feels, however, that the primary responsibility for governing students should rest with the students. The Committee believes, primarily as advisors, that students should be allowed to conduct their own affairs under a set of laws approved by the faculty, subject only to necessary checks where the basic welfare of the college is involved. At present, though this principle is often followed in practice, SFFC has an automatic power of review which limits the power of student Council to that of recommendation. Further SFFC can take action without recourse to Student Council; this constitutes a serious limitation of student self-government. It is the feeling of having no effective power rather than specific action of SFCSA or SFSCS that has led to student dissatisfaction. Faculty members should act, the Committee believes, primarily as advisors to head off trouble before it arises. Student-Faculty committees should be committees of last appeal only.

Power to initiate action

(4) The Committee, therefore, recommends the substitution of the following for the present machinery.

(a) Student Council shall have the power to initiate action in all cases where the welfare of the student is involved. The Student Council or its Fee Committee shall be empowered to allocate fee funds. The Student Council and its Fee Committee shall both act under a set of laws approved by the SC by-laws and approved by the faculty. This set of principles shall be formulated by the SC selected at the next regular election specifically as a constitution making body, charged with the responsibility of drawing up a constitution after holding open hearings on the question.

We cordially invite all those interested in fraternity to our annual address, Phi Delta Pi 511 W. 139 St.

Chapter Gamma

"Where fraternal ties have been strengthened..."
How much money do you want to save—

$394?

$3,272?

$23,682?

Here is a sure, simple savings plan that guarantees you'll get it!

You can save—just as eight million other men and women are saving right now. All you have to do is take one simple step.

Today, where you work, sign up to invest in United States Savings Bonds through the Payroll Savings Plan. Sign up to save a couple of dollars a payday, or as much as you wish.

The money will be automatically saved for you every payday and invested in Bonds which will be automatically turned over to you.

If you can save just $6.25 a month on Payroll Savings, in 5 years you'll have your $394 cash. If you can save $25 a month, you'll have your $3,272 cash in 9 years and 8 months. And if you can save $75 a month, in 19 years 8 months, you'll have a small fortune—$23,682.

How about signing up in the Payroll Savings Plan now?

If you're self-employed, go to your bank and have your banker get you started in the automatic Bond-A-Month Plan.

How you can reach your savings goal on the systematic Payroll Savings Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount Needed</th>
<th>$1,000</th>
<th>$2,000</th>
<th>$5,000</th>
<th>$10,000</th>
<th>$25,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 years, save</td>
<td>$3.75</td>
<td>$7.50</td>
<td>$18.75</td>
<td>$37.50</td>
<td>$93.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 years, save</td>
<td>$4.40</td>
<td>$8.80</td>
<td>$21.05</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td>$105.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 years, save</td>
<td>$5.15</td>
<td>$10.30</td>
<td>$25.50</td>
<td>$50.60</td>
<td>$126.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This chart shows only a few typical examples of savings goals and how to reach them through Payroll Savings. For other amounts, your nearest bank or savings and loan office can help you see how much you can save a couple of dollars a payday to fill a need. The important thing is, start your plan today!
For Student Democracy

On President Gallagher’s desk today are two contradictory reports. One is from the Presidential Committee on Student-Faculty Relations; the other was submitted by the General Faculty Committee on Student Activities (GFCSA).

The decision as to which report to accept, which to submit to the General Faculty itself for approval, lies strictly up to the President.

Observation Post urges Dr. Gallagher to endorse the report of the Presidential committee he appointed eleven months ago.

The essential difference between the reports is this: the Presidential report, while retaining final right of approval with an Appeals Board and then with GFCSA, would assign the daily management of student activities to the Student Council, a group elected by the student body.

The GFCSA report would preserve the existing Student-Faculty Committee on Student Affairs (SFCSA), an all-powerful governing body which meets in secret, a group not elected by the people it governs, and whose faculty members serve forever.

Dark hints by GFCSA to the contrary, the Presidential Committee report in no way prevents the faculty from exercising final judgment over student actions, if it wishes to do so. It merely transfers the day-to-day management of student activities from the faculty to the student level. In its implications that the faculty will be prevented from becoming involved, or having any say in student activities, the GFCSA is doing a grave disservice to truth.

The recommendation for a Board of Advisors for Student Council to be composed of faculty members, a major point of the Presidential report, is completely ignored by GFCSA. Evidently, the faculty members, administrators, and Student Life members on this committee prefer frustrating students in the privacy of the Faculty Lounge to taking things over with students in the cafeteria.

In the GFCSA report, review by SFCSA of Student Council’s actions is likened to the Board of Higher Education’s approval of faculty decisions. This is a thoroughly invalid analogy. BHE approval is a formal, legalistic check, a new review of the case. SFCSA has shown a tendency to treat every student decision as a public opinion poll. It makes up its own mind, based on its own whims, as to what it thinks is best for the student body.

Observation Post feels that SFCSA is a body that has long outlived its usefulness. At best, it is an inferior process for governing student activities. At its current level of misunderstanding, suspicion and distrust, it is a poor substitute for student-faculty cooperation.

This will be a major decision for President Gallagher. And we are looking forward with keen interest to see what will be. Hundreds of man-hours of work and sincere effort by students and faculty alike are involved in the Presidential Committee report. Its fate may well decide the future of student democracy at City College.
Dave Polansky succeeded Nat Holman as basketball mentor in 1951, and led a revamped team to a successful 10-6 record. As an undergraduate at City College, he played under Holman for two seasons; and in track, he captured the Metropolitan AAU half-mile event in 1941, and the National Junior AAU crown in 1942. After his graduation, he coached the track team, and was assistant Faculty Manager of Athletics.

George "Red" Wolfe is both the coach of the freshman basketball and varsity soccer teams. His claim to fame was his ability to lead the soccer team to the 1953 Metropolitan Conference championship in his first year as mentor. With the frosh hoopers, he compiled a 7-9 record last season.

Joe Sapore, the diminutive likeable solon of the wrestling team, is a renowned grappler in his own right. In his college career he chalked up the 118-pound titles in the NCAA, Met Senior, New York State, and the National AAU championships between 1929-32. He has guided the Beavers for 21 years.

In his eighth season as coach of the swimming team, Jack Rider is one of the finest of his ilk in the country. This year’s squad is shaping up as one of his best; and he has had great performers, who, under his tutelage have racked up many new marks, including, Howie Schloemer’s 220 and 440 yard freestyle records.

When Professor Montague, who coached fencing for 23 years at the College, retired in 1953, Edward Lucia took over the reins. His previous experience consisted of a successful span of years at the Riverdale Country School when his charges took 53 out of 57 contests. Before coming to CCNY, he held down the position at St. Peter’s College.

Yustin Sirutis heads the only Metropolitan College boxing team. At NYU, as an undergraduate, he won the Intercollegiate Boxing Championship in 1930, and the Golden Gloves heavyweight title in 1931.
Meet the Varsity

By BERND LORGE

When Bernie Lloyd, undefeated in the last year, graduated at the end of last season, Coach Sopora was faced with the challenge of replacing an accomplished wrestler. At the start of the season, the team was listed as second in the Eastern Intercollegiate Wrestling Association, but with the departure of Lloyd, the team was faced with a new season and new challenges.

Joseph Sopora, the new head coach, has a strong group of returning wrestlers and has high hopes for the team's performance. The opening day of the season was a turning point for the team, as they hosted a triangular match against Queens College and CCNY. The team eked out a victory over NYU in their first home meet.

The team has developed a strong bond, with many of the wrestlers also involved in other sports, such as track and field. The wrestlers have been working hard to improve their performance, and with the support of their coach and teammates, they are confident in their ability to perform well.

The team's performance has been noticed by the media, with articles in the newspaper highlighting their achievements and potential for success. With the team's strong work ethic and dedication, they are well on their way to achieving their goals for the season.
By JOE MARCUS

The City College Basketball team snapped a three game losing streak Saturday by defeating a rugged Hofstra five, 60-55 in overtime at the Hempstead Long Island court. The Beavers came from behind to knot the game at 50-50; with two minutes gone in the overtime. After Bill Thieben had cut the Beaver lead to 56-53, Merv Shorr, who wound up the contest with 13 points (second only to Domershick’s 16), hit for a jump shot and followed with a tap in to put the game on ice for the St. Knicks Forces.

Temper’s flared from start to finish in the hard fought game. The Flying Dutchman started off slowly in the initial stanza and soon found themselves behind to knot the game at 50-50; with two minutes gone in the overtime. After Bill Thieben had cut the Beaver lead to 56-53, Merv Shorr, who wound up the contest with 13 points (second only to Domershick’s 16), hit for a jump shot and followed with a tap in to put the game on ice for the St. Knicks Forces.
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