

PUBLIC HEARING

before

Senate and Assembly Committees on Education
[in accordance with Assembly Concurrent
Resolution No. 86 to study and examine the
operational programs at Rutgers, The State
University.]

Held:

June 9, 1969
Assembly Chamber
State House
Trenton, New Jersey

MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE PRESENT:

Senator William T. Hiering [Chairman - Senate]
Assemblyman Thomas H. Kean [Chairman - Assembly]
Senator Wayne Dumont, Jr.
Assemblyman Samuel A. Curcio
Assemblyman John H. Ewing
Assemblyman Ralph R. Caputo
Assemblywoman Josephine S. Margetts
Assemblyman Robert N. Wilentz
Assemblyman Ronald Owens

* * *

I N D E X

<u>Name</u>	<u>Page</u>
Ralph A. Dungan Chancellor, Department of Higher Education	1
Dr. Mason Gross President, Rutgers University	42
Thomas A. Hendricks Somerville, New Jersey	97
Anthony J. Volpe State Director Division of Veterans Services	1 A
Marvin W. Greenberg Assistant Vice President of Rutgers in Newark	6 A
Dr. Charles Pine Newark College of Arts and Sciences at Rutgers	19 A
Dr. Irwin L. Merker Faculty Chairman of Admissions Rutgers, Newark	35 A
Dr. Henry Blumenthal Newark College of Arts and Sciences	43 A
Dr. John B. Robertson Assistant Dean Newark College of Arts and Sciences	51 A
Frank J. Costanzo Newark Student Council	62 A
Ralph Fucetola, III Co-Chairman New Jersey Coalition for a Peaceful Campus	67 A
Miss Mary Jane Williams Editor, "The Observer" Newark College of Arts and Sciences	80 A
William E. Jeney President Rutgers Alumni Association	87 A
Mrs. Frank Stamato Director League of Women Voters of New Jersey	90 A
Dr. Arnold B. Grobman Dean, Rutgers College New Brunswick	93 A

INDEX [Continued]

<u>Name</u>	<u>Page</u>
John R. Martin Assistant Provost Rutgers University	108 A
Margery Somers Foster Dean, Douglass College Rutgers University	119 A
Howard J. Crosby Dean of Students Rutgers College	128 A
Dr. Richard P. McCormick Professor of History Rutgers College	131 A
W. Layton Hall Dean, Camden Campus Rutgers University	139 A
Dr. Henry Winkler Vice Provost and Dean of the Faculty of Liberal Arts Rutgers University	148 A
Edward C. McGuire Dean of Students Rutgers, Newark	150 A

- - - -

SENATOR WILLIAM T. HIERING (Chairman): I would like to call the hearing to order.

This hearing today is on Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 86, which Resolution, very succinctly stated, provides that the Senate and Assembly Committees on Education are directed to hold public hearings on and study and examine the operational programs at Rutgers, The State University.

Now those present here from the Senate and Assembly Committees are, first, to my right, Assemblyman Kean who is Chairman of the Assembly Education Committee; immediately to my left is Senator Dumont; to my right, Assemblyman Ewing, Assemblywoman Margetts, and Assemblyman Curcio.

I might state that prior to hearing our first witness, if there is anyone in the audience who wishes to be heard and who is not yet on our list, please feel free to come forward and we will be glad to put you on the list of speakers.

Now, first, we will hear from Chancellor Ralph A. Dungan.

R A L P H A. D U N G A N: Senator Hiering, Assemblyman Kean, Mrs. Margetts, gentlemen, it is a pleasure to appear before you as you begin your hearings to examine into the operational programs at Rutgers, The State University.

I must say, I'm a little perplexed because the scope of your charge is as broad as it is. I am perplexed about telling you anything about that great enterprise, which is the State University, which might be relevant to your concerns. I would like to say, however, that in my relatively

brief experience in New Jersey the University, under Dr. Gross' leadership, it seems to me, has performed admirably, particularly when one takes a look at the history of the Institution and a relative - that is, relative to the support that has been given other state universities throughout the country, the relatively excellent performance, both in terms of numbers and quality of output, which has characterized Rutgers.

We, as you know, like universities, private and public, throughout the land have been beset by difficulties during this past year most of which, I would suggest, are not of the making of the academic enterprise itself; they are vastly influenced by external forces, in my opinion, and it does us little good, indeed, in a Chamber of this type, to consider some of those forces because we have very little control over them.

Nevertheless, despite the travail, which higher education in the country has experienced, and the pressures which we in New Jersey have experienced, I would say that the University has come through very well due, in very large measure, to its leadership, the President, the Provost, the faculty, the sensitivity and sensibilities of the students, and I think a wise and informed Legislature and Executive Branch here in Trenton, at least as far as public education is concerned.

So, Mr. Chairman, I'll bring my brief remarks to an end and stand ready to answer any questions which you or any other member of the Committee may have.

SENATOR HIERING: Thank you, Chancellor.

Do members of the Committee have any questions?

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: Chancellor, you've made a proposal, which has aroused quite a bit of controversy, to separate the Newark Campus and make it part of another university in Northern New Jersey. Could you go into that proposal in detail?

MR. DUNGAN: Mr. Kean, I think you dignify it a little bit more than I would by calling it a proposal. I have suggested that certain intrinsic characteristics of the complex of public higher education institutions in the downtown Newark area suggest that we look at the possibility of uniting those several institutions in some sort of framework, whether organic or otherwise, which would yield greater educational unity and, I believe, a good deal more efficiency.

You should know, and I think you do, certainly the members of the Education Committee know, that we have since the very early days of the new Department of Higher Education encouraged institutions in Newark to associate themselves in a voluntary enterprise to see that there is good interplay of one kind or another among the several institutions. It's to the great credit, I think, of the leadership of those institutions that we've had as fine progress as we have had already.

Now, whether this needs to be taken to an ultimate step of uniting the several institutions in one, seems to me, is a question that bears some exploration. I think it probably would be best done by people outside the

institutional structure, although with their full involvement and participation, simply because institutions, educational institutions like all others, tend to begin to identify with a particular interest rather than broader public interests.

Nevertheless, I do not believe that this unity of an organic variety, if indeed it is acritically necessary, need to occur in the immediate future. I do think we need to push, however, no matter what happens in terms of organic unity, for continued collaboration among the several institutions in such areas as libraries or other facilities which might more economically be produced on a joint basis. For instance, you might be interested to know that in addition to the statewide computer facility that we've been talking about, the institutions at Newark are already talking about uniting their several computer responsibilities in some sort of a centralized or integrated facility. This, as you all know, computers being as expensive as they are, probably will yield more value to the public if it's done on a joint basis.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: What institutions would you propose, or what institutions might be included?

MR. DUNGAN: I believe in the nature of things that this unity ought to be confined to the senior institutions, that is to The Newark College of Arts and Sciences, The Law School, The Graduate School of Business, Nursing, NCE, and The New Jersey College of Medicine and Dentistry. These have programs which are logically related and flow one into the other. The Community College does also. However, it is, as you understand, a unique institution, being essentially a

State-aided county institution. And, in any event, the breadth of this program span probably makes it inappropriate to be organically joined to the other institutions although I certainly hope and believe that the Community College's activities will be very closely integrated with those of the senior institutions.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: What steps would have to be taken in order to make this a reality?

MR. DUNGAN: Well I would think the first step that probably ought to be undertaken would be the appointment by the Board of Higher Education of a committee of its own members or possibly a small group of people not directly associated in higher education enterprise.

I think the question here is to give the public, as well as the people in the institutions concerned, the sense of confidence that these decisions are not being made or even suggested out of any kind of narrow or limited point of view.

Incidentally, I want to be very, very clear that there can be very legitimate contrary points of view and these ought to be fully explored. And, as I say, my proposal, which has been on the table for more than a year now, is basically that we look at the situation.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: Along the line of admissions to the really higher education system of the State, it has been talked about or proposed by many people that in the ghetto areas of this State the group, so that these able people can get into our institutions of higher education, would be

first doing remedial work in the community colleges and then transferring to state colleges or the State University. What kind of programs have been developed up to this point - if this is going to be the way in which this is going to operate in many areas of the State what programs have been developed to bring this about?

MR. DUNGAN: Well, each of the community colleges, depending a little bit on the clientele that's served in the county or in the immediate area surrounding the institution, have programs of so-called remedial work. Some, as a matter of philosophy and conviction, are more oriented toward what is known in the business these days as open-door admissions, that is that youngsters who have any level of attainment out of high school are admitted into one or another of the educational programs. Some of the community colleges tend to be more traditional and more oriented toward the transfer type programs which insure that a youngster goes on through to a baccalaureate degree. But I would say in each of our institutions, the county institutions, you do find remedial programs designed to assist youngsters who are late bloomers or who in some way have deficient high school educational background.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: Do you know what lines of communication are open? If these people succeed in the community college, the community college does its job in this area, what lines of communication are there open to get these students into either the State University or a State College?

MR. DUNGAN: Right, how do we insure that they move on? Well, this, of course, as you know, Assemblyman, is one of the critical questions which the whole system faces. There is great concern, particularly among the sending institutions, about the acceptance of graduates whom they consider to be qualified to go on for the baccalaureate or higher degree. There is a similar concern, although obviously not as pressing for obvious reasons, among the senior institutions. Nevertheless, I think the record thus far of the senior institutions, public institutions particularly, has been laudable. Private institutions in the State also have taken and are taking increasingly large numbers of transfers from the community colleges.

The pressure at the present time, of course, is to take everyone. This is the line that one gets from community college people. And I think that's not at all unreasonable in a theoretical sense. I do think though, as a practical matter, that it's going to take some time until the senior level institutions begin to have some history of productivity, if you will, from the transferring students before you will have as open and as fluid a situation as one might want.

I must say to you that on a national basis, contrary to the expectations of many, transferees from community colleges do as well or better in surviving the four-year baccalaureate program as their brothers or sisters who come in as freshmen. And this has been the trend here in New Jersey with our very limited experience.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: One final question. I have read in the press of I think four or five master plans for higher education in this State. I have seen one which is, I gather from the press, the second draft from your office. There evidently was an original first draft. I have read there's one from the State Colleges. I've read there's one from Rutgers. Do you have copies of all these master plans?

MR. DUNGAN: Not only those from within the State but from outside also. Yes, it is a little confusing. I think it has been to some members of the press and probably the public also. And it always happens when you throw a complex question like this one as open to comment from everyone, as we have, and that's been rather purposeful, I imagine. I don't imagine, I know, because it certainly hasn't been our purpose to confuse. But we have attempted to put thoughts out onto the table, into the marketplace, so to speak, so that everyone can shoot at them. And I must say it has been a very healthy and wise thing that we did it that way because many of the assumptions that were implied in the original draft outline are now being rethought by members of the Board of Higher Education and certainly by the staff.

So, you know, at this stage in the game we do not have anything that one could call a definitive master plan. I must say also that it's only been in recent months that you can say that throughout the institutions in New Jersey, whether we're talking about the independent ones or the public ones, that you've had what I would call

concentrated attention on advanced educational and physical planning. I don't think it's a condemnation of anyone. I think it's just a fact of life. Higher education, unlike many institutions in this country, has not been - it's grown more like Topsy, particularly in the years since the Second World War than some other institutions. I think now, with costs rising the way they are, with tremendous demands, the people are beginning to understand the necessity for some degree of rational educational and physical and financial planning.

SENATOR HIERING: Well on this matter of the master plan, Chancellor, I note also from the papers that Rutgers is about to release their master plan. Now, are you familiar with this master plan? Is there coordination between your department and Rutgers in connection with this or are you going to take their master plan and try to fit it into what you're doing?

MR. DUNGAN: I think what you've read about, Senator, - I don't believe that the University has under consideration a master plan for the State. I think it has a master plan for the University. And to a certain extent the State's master plan will be a combination, not simply a sum of but a combination of the master plans of several campuses, including the State University.

SENATOR HIERING: Well, is there coordination between your Department and Rutgers, for instance, in connection with their master plan which naturally concerns Rutgers alone.

MR. DUNGAN: Yes, there is. We have been privy to all of the staff papers that have been produced within the University and I must say, Senator, that they have been of the highest quality, in my opinion.

SENATOR HIERING: Now, getting to this matter of admission of the economically disadvantaged students and the open-door policy of Rutgers. Don't we, in effect, have this same open-door policy today in our community colleges?

MR. DUNGAN: To a very large extent, sir, we do, and this has been strengthened by the action of the Legislature in passing the Educational Opportunity Fund last year which, in my opinion, was a great success and a wise move on your part.

SENATOR HIERING: Well, aren't we actually duplicating at Rutgers what is already arranged for and what we are doing in the community college, for instance the Essex Community College where I understand that through the EOF you've put a lot of these people in this College which is a fine thing.

MR. DUNGAN: Approximately 500.

SENATOR HIERING: Isn't this going to be a duplication at Rutgers of what we are already doing in our community college?

MR. DUNGAN: Well, if you are asking me do I believe that the community college should be the point at which we concentrate attention on the youngster who is so-called educationally disadvantaged, my answer to that is yes. This does not mean, however, in my opinion, that I

think it's the exclusive place where such a young man or woman ought to begin his collegiate career. I think it's good for him and I think it's good for the institution in question that you have a range of talents and backgrounds within the institutional setting. But I do agree with the implication of your question that the concentration for the so-called poorly prepared, educationally disadvantaged, should be at the community college.

SENATOR HIERING: To actually put in a program for the training of these economically disadvantaged in Rutgers will be a costly proposition and if we are already doing it in the community colleges wouldn't it be much less expensive and more economical to expand it in that field and not actually pick it up and start a new program in one of our State Universities?

MR. DUNGAN: Not necessarily so, Senator. It seems to me that the University or any institution ought to be as capable of producing a program of this type on the same terms and conditions as the community colleges can. It is not a question of cost per unit being substantially different at the University, it's a question of cost per unit for type of program. Transfer programs, for instance, ought to cost - at the community college level ought to cost roughly what the so-called lower division program at a State University or State College is going to cost. Conversely, a program basically oriented to remediation at the University level shouldn't cost any more than it would at the community college or any other institution,

as far as that goes.

SENATOR HIERING: Now the Rutgers' policy, of course, is limited to the three cities of Newark, New Brunswick and Camden.

MR. DUNGAN: Yes, sir.

SENATOR HIERING: Now I know that I've been getting a lot of letters, and I presume many of the other Legislators have too, from somebody in East Orange or West Orange or somebody in South Jersey asking, "Why don't we who are poor and disadvantaged have the same opportunity as you have if you live in the city?" What is your answer to that?

MR. DUNGAN: My answer is that more than likely they do because there are programs, as you suggested in your previous question, at your Community College, for instance, in Ocean, as there is in Essex, and in almost every county of the State, as well as the State Colleges, where young men and women who suffer the same kinds of disadvantages sought to be compensated for by the Rutgers' program may enter. And, indeed, as you all know, about 1600 youngsters throughout the State are exactly in this situation.

Put it a little bit differently. The Rutgers' program is not that revolutionary. It basically is an extension of the philosophy that's involved in your Educational Opportunity Fund.

SENATOR HIERING: Are you considering putting this same policy in our other State Colleges?

MR. DUNGAN: Well, as far as policy is concerned, I think the State Colleges are attempting to do what they

think is best in numerical and other terms in accommodating youngsters who are in this particular situation.

SENATOR HIERING: But, as of now, they have no open-door policy wherein they would say everyone who graduates from high school in this particular area has a right to come to this college.

MR. DUNGAN: That's correct.

SENATOR HIERING: Does anyone else have any questions?

By the way, I might report that Assemblyman Wilentz of the Assembly Education Committee has joined us. He is at my far left.

SENATOR DUMONT: Chancellor, I think you said there are 1600 apparently disadvantaged children around the State. It is my recollection, if they are taken from Newark, New Brunswick and Camden this would be about 400 admissions to Rutgers. Now, do you think it is fair to say admit the 400 but deny the admission of the other 1200 to the State University simply because they live in towns other than Newark, Camden or New Brunswick?

MR. DUNGAN: No, sir. If I understand your question correctly, I would say that the 1600 that we dealt with last year had a crack at New Brunswick or either of the other two campuses of the State University and most of them found their places, whether in a public or in a private institution, according to their own choice. And I suspect that many of the young men and women who will be coming in under the so-called Urban University Program may very well elect not to take that option but rather to exercise an

option to go to another institution under EOF.

Perhaps I don't get your question exactly, Senator, but I don't think there is any discrimination necessarily against disadvantaged students in other communities of the State, other than New Brunswick, Camden and Newark.

SENATOR DUMONT: Well, this proposal to admit approximately 400 from Newark, Camden and New Brunswick, is that about the number of children that would be admitted?

MR. DUNGAN: That is one estimate that's been used. I think it's very shaky estimating in this area. We don't know.

SENATOR DUMONT: Have you any idea as to how much that will cost?

MR. DUNGAN: I have seen the budget figures that were prepared by the University some weeks ago. Yes, I have an idea.

SENATOR DUMONT: Well, would you tell us what that is or do you want it released by the University?

MR. DUNGAN: I think the figure that was used by the University for the some 875 students that were estimated was \$2.7 million. There were two other programs that are closely related to it that were thrown into the figure which appeared in some press stories. Dr. Gross I'm sure can comment in more detail on that.

SENATOR DUMONT: Well, now, we are all aware of the fact that for a number of years Rutgers has not had sufficient physical space to take many students who would appear to be qualified for admission to Rutgers, so they

have had to seek their education elsewhere.

Now, let's assume that they come from so-called middleclass families who might be able to afford it or might have to have some student aid in order to have their sons get into Rutgers, whether it be scholarship or loans or whatever it might be. And let's assume further that Rutgers will be admitting 400 or more students who are disadvantaged. Now, isn't it a fact that those students from the other families are not going to be able to get to Rutgers where there already is not enough space and, if what additional spaces are provided are going to go to the disadvantaged children solely, that in turn more of the other type students will have to be turned down for admission to Rutgers? Isn't that so?

MR. DUNGAN: No, I don't think that is so, Senator. I don't think there is any diminution as a result of the special program in the number of so-called regular students to be admitted to the State University.

SENATOR DUMONT: Then how many more spaces - let me phrase it this way, is Rutgers planning to provide enough spaces not only to take care of more students who are qualified but at the present time are not admitted to Rutgers, along with the disadvantaged children?

MR. DUNGAN: I'm sorry, Senator, --

SENATOR DUMONT: Well, let's assume that 3,000 freshmen are admitted - I don't remember the exact figure - to Rutgers. Suppose now you are going to take, in addition to that number in a freshman class, 400 or 500 disadvantaged

children, will Rutgers be providing, say, 4,000 spaces so that they can take more of the so-called middleclass family children along with the disadvantaged children or will all of the additional spaces, if there are any additional, go to the disadvantaged children?

MR. DUNGAN: I would say that if there is an increase in the number of spaces at the University there will be an equitable - I can't say what the exact distribution of spaces would be between the so-called disadvantaged and regular admissions.

Obviously, Senator, the real objective of all of our educational endeavors is to eliminate this unfortunate group of people whom we now term disadvantaged.

I think that all students that are graduates of our high schools throughout the State ought to be coming into the educational marketplace on even terms. The fact of the matter is that a very substantial proportion of them do not. And until the community, it seems to me, regresses that serious imbalance for whatever reason, you will always find the necessity for compensation, compensatory action, not monetary compensation, which is at the very heart of the kind of program we are talking about.

I could quite agree with you, however, that we should be addressing ourselves not to the symptoms but to the cause of this educational disequilibrium.

SENATOR DUMONT: Well, Chancellor, I don't think anybody who has any feelings for people, and I believe we all do, has any basic argument with trying to help the

disadvantaged children. The real question is whether they can be helped more at the State University where they come there perhaps not fulfilling the standards for admission that are ordinarily required at Rutgers or whether they can be helped more earlier than when they get to the time when they would go to college. I think that's our basic difficulty.

MR. DUNGAN: Well, I'll tell you, Senator, I certainly opt for the latter option, that is, helping them earlier. But what are you going to say to John Jones who is now 16 or 17 years old? "Gee, fellow, don't worry, we'll take care of your younger brother who is 5 but for you it is all lost."

I say that we have that youngster, John Jones, to cope with, not to cope with but to assist, and if it means the adoption of special programs like this, whether at the State University or elsewhere, then I say we must do it.

And if I may, Senator, one other point. The experience under the EOF in the last year has been not only gratifying but extremely touching in some cases, where you have a young man or woman, and one comes to mind, who is on welfare with two children, no hope, no hope really, and through the EOF programs, she happens to be enrolled in a private institution in the State, that girl will turn out with a degree and with an earning capacity and a dignity, which is probably much more important, different than she would have ever had had the EOF Program not come along. And that will happen, I believe, predictably, with most of the

youngsters that come in under the Rutgers' special program.

SENATOR DUMONT: Well, I think that part is fine but the fact remains that what you're going to do this for is basically such children from three communities and you're saying to the others, in effect, that you've got to find an answer somewhere else, such as at your county community college or wherever else it may be.

Now let's go back to this proposal that you have made with respect to Newark. Do I understand, from what you said, that you would recommend that the Rutgers' Campus in Newark be, in a sense, merged with the New Jersey College of Medicine and Dentistry and the New Jersey College of Engineering and Science, and that everything in Newark would therefore be under say one board of trustees? Is that the proposal?

MR. DUNGAN: That's one option. There are a variety of others that would not involve such a formal connection among the several institutions, but that is one possibility, yes, sir.

SENATOR DUMONT: And that board of trustees, would that actually be separate from the Board of Governors of the State University or would it be under the jurisdiction of the Board of Governors still, in a sense, being a part of Rutgers, or would it be a separate center of higher learning?

MR. DUNGAN: It could be either way. I would think, consistent with the philosophy of the Higher Education Act, which seemed to set up Boards of Trustees for obvious and coherent units of higher education, in this case the State

Colleges, the philosophy of having a board independent, within the system, would be the one that most logically ought to obtain in the Newark situation that we've just described.

SENATOR DUMONT: Now do you have a similar proposal for the Camden Campus of Rutgers?

MR. DUNGAN: No. I think that's a much different situation, Senator. I think what makes the Newark situation at all logical in my opinion is the kind and variety of educational operations that we have going; after all, you have the Law School, you have the Medical School, you have a Graduate School of Business, an Undergraduate and Graduate Engineering School, and a fine Arts and Sciences Institution supporting the whole structure. That, that I just described, is a very high class university in terms of the departmental elements that are involved.

SENATOR DUMONT: Well, of course, you have a Law School in Camden too.

MR. DUNGAN: That's correct. You don't have some of the other characteristics, however.

SENATOR DUMONT: Right. Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILENTZ: Chancellor, on the Newark situation, combining all of these institutions and having possibly a board of trustees over all of them, it suggests to me that it is not simply the kind of education that's going on in Newark that makes it logical but some feeling you may have that it's not going on right, right now, either that it is not going on properly or that there is some potential direction that it might take that would require this kind of

coordination. Perhaps I missed the point but it would seem to me that that would be the real justification for the proposal.

MR. DUNGAN: I wouldn't say, Assemblyman, that it's not going right. Indeed I happen to be a very strong partisan of the several elements of both Rutgers and NCE and the College of Medicine in Newark. I think they are good institutions. I think, with the voluntary, cooperative council that they now have, that there is a good deal of interchange going on on a wide variety of subjects, substantive education ones as well as others.

I also think, however, that if there had been a mandated situation in the past you would not find two libraries basically geared to undergraduate education separated by, I think it's High Street and about 50 yards of concrete.

Now this kind of physical duplication, if you will, strikes me as being rather horrendous. Now it could be avoided, as I suggested to Senator Dumont, in a variety of ways, a loose confederation of institutions, a structural unity with a board of trustees, and I am not that hung up on a particular solution to the problem, and it may very well be that a continuation of the present loose coordination will be quite satisfactory. I think, myself, that it's more likely that you will have effective collaboration among the several elements in that complex if it has its own board of trustees. It will have greater intellectual as well as spiritual unity.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILENTZ: Well certainly coordination is guaranteed if there is one board of trustees running the whole show.

MR. DUNGAN: Not guaranteed, it's more likely.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILENTZ: More likely is right.

Is it this physical duplication that is the problem? I mean, what's the problem that you're directing your attention to.

MR. DUNGAN: No, I believe there is also programmatic articulation which is more than likely to occur within an organic unity if the administration, particularly the administration but also the trustees, are operating with a view toward where the situation --

ASSEMBLYMAN WILENTZ: What kind of --

MR. DUNGAN: Well, let me give you an example of the kind of articulation which to me is very important.

Up until about a year ago there was a baccalaureate as well as graduate school of nursing connected with the University. There was a two year program at the Community College leading to an RN and there was a hospital School of Nursing which the Medical School took over when it took over the City Hospital. Now it could have been that those three programs would have continued along quite parallel to one another with no interrelation, programmatically speaking, among them. So that a young lady who was going into the nursing profession as an RN and finally decided she wanted to go for a baccalaureate or master's degree might not have been able to transfer into the Rutgers'

program.

Now, through this coordinating mechanism, those three programs, I'm delighted to say, are highly integrated so that one can move from one to the other and there is a good deal of interchange both at the clinical and academic level.

An example. Now you might say, yes but you were able to do that within this loose cooperative framework. True enough. What would have happened had one of those institutions balked?

ASSEMBLYMAN WILENTZ: Well, apparently, they didn't. And I gather, or at least I assume that the problem of coordination and prevention of overlapping courses and facilities and unnecessary duplication, at the same time trying to preserve the freedom of institutions to develop in their own way, is one of the basic purposes of your Department.

MR. DUNGAN: Correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILENTZ: To provide that kind of coordination within groupings of institutions that still continue functioning on their own. And I wonder, other than the fact that you find all of these in one place that's called Newark, - I mean, you can find, I assume, in other counties, and as Senator Dumont indicated even in other cities, - what is there that makes the coordinative function no longer seem attractive and something a little bit heavier seem more effective?

MR. DUNGAN: As I said, Assemblyman, I'm not really that hung up, to use the slang expression, on that particular

formal trustee dominated organizational structure. If it's determined that some other kind of structure, including the one that exists today, loose as it is, is quite appropriate, that's all right by me.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILENTZ: Getting to this question of discrimination, on the basis of where someone lives, in Newark, Camden or New Brunswick, I take it that what Rutgers announced as its policy for disadvantaged students, which indicated to the entire State that there was perhaps some advantage in living in either Newark, Camden or New Brunswick, had some factual support. There is some factual basis to that, I assume.

MR. DUNGAN: That there is some educational disadvantage to living in those --

ASSEMBLYMAN WILENTZ: No, that there is some educational advantage. In other words, the program of admitting the disadvantaged, as announced by Rutgers, had some meaning.

MR. DUNGAN: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILENTZ: And my recollection of the many justifications put forth by Rutgers included one of the necessary cooperation and relationship between an institution and the community in which it is located.

Do you believe that we are going to have to apply to every approach and every solution in this area some notion of perfection? In other words, the point is constantly made that the Senator made, and it's obviously a good point, you know, I live in East Orange, why should

this happen to me? or why don't I get the same break?
Aren't we faced here with a situation that is so difficult that, try as we must, we have to just devise solutions as we go along hoping that we will improve the situation even if it isn't perfect?

MR. DUNGAN: Yes. And then, of course, the reason that we have the special programs, whether the Urban University Program at Rutgers or otherwise, is simply because the system is as imperfect as it is.

I think it's a scandal, for instance, that a youngster who comes out of Newark or some other community, not accusing Newark in this sense, but any community, who is deficient relative to his brother who comes out of another district, and a very imperfect and undesirable situation. But life is imperfect and unfair.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILENTZ: And it's better than the situation where the disadvantaged didn't get to school at all, I take it.

MR. DUNGAN: I think so.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILENTZ: As I understood your answer, you indicated an agreement with those who feel that the concentration on admitting the disadvantaged to institutions of higher education ought to be in the community college or the county college. I would just like to examine that very briefly.

It was my understanding that the students that came in under EOF to either Rutgers or to any of the State Colleges performed quite well. In view of that performance,

except for the physical capabilities of the school, I don't understand why the disadvantaged ought to be relegated - not that there is anything wrong with county colleges but to the extent that there is a difference in the quality of education, I don't know why they should be concentrated in the county college.

MR. DUNGAN: Well, I think what you're saying reflects what I believe is a very unsound misconception of the community college within a higher education structure such as we have.

I believe it to be a very important, high quality, first step in the higher education system, not a second-rate institution. And I wish some of my colleagues, and there are many of them I think in the senior institutions who look down their noses because a youngster doesn't score at a particular level on an SAT score, which in itself, if you ask an academician honestly what it really proves will tell you not very much. So that I think the whole credential and certifying hang-up that we've got ourselves in in American higher education is doing us a great disservice.

I make my point, with respect to the community college and its relevance to the kind of youngster we're talking about, fundamentally because I believe, and to an increasing degree in American higher education, we are going to move into a specialization of functions within various institutions in the system with the university, whether this University or another, assuming the more traditional role of training scholars.

Now if you want to say that's of a higher quality, yes, in a sense, but if you look on the function of institutions, whether a basically undergraduate college or a community college, as performing a perfectly valid and important and high quality function for the particular purpose that the youngster had in mind who goes to that institution, then you don't have a problem. It's only when you introduce what I think are basically snobbish notions that because one goes to the University it's a higher quality - it is of higher quality for a particular kind of fellow, for a particular kind of work, not for everyone. So there are differences in functions, just as there are lawyers and doctors and real estate men, teachers, there are different kinds of people who require different kinds of education and that can be given in different kinds of institutions.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILENTZ: But after all is said and done, the snobbishness is one way of perhaps inaccurately reflecting the differences between these institutions but it's another thing, and I frankly can't understand it, to say these are great schools and this is where the disadvantaged ought to be "concentrated." I mean, it would seem to me that the question is, what are the facilities which each institution has available, what kind of programs can they devise, and to the extent that there is a difference between Rutgers and perhaps the State Colleges, on the one hand, and the County Colleges on the other, I can't follow what the reason is for concentrating the

disadvantaged in the county colleges if the fact is that programs have been devised which will enable them to perform quite creditably at the State University.

MR. DUNGAN: Well, I would say I think the only logical answer to your observation, Mr. Wilentz, is that by definition these youngsters are high risks, they're high risks psychologically and they're high risks academically. And in that sense they ought to be in an institutional framework, in my opinion, where there are a variety of educational options including the option of going on to the baccalaureate degree.

But if one looks, - I'm thinking of one of our county colleges where we happen to have a small enrollment of EOF students this year, small enough to observe it carefully; all of those youngsters were enrolled, I think, because of poor counselling, into a transfer program. Some of them, incidentally, weren't youngsters, they were well over the college entry age. By midterm 50% of that small group of 20 had shifted out of the transfer program into another program more suited to their own objectives, not to their capacities. They wanted professional training, they wanted a leg up in the vocational and occupational ladder. Perfectly fine.

Now if they had been in an institution primarily aimed, as in the case of a University, at scholarship or into a different kind of academic training, they would have been lost.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILENTZ: Well, I think there is a

question of direction. Is there any intent on the part of your Department, for instance, to discourage the designing of programs for the disadvantaged at the State University, on the one hand, and to encourage it at the county college level, or are you willing to see how the thing develops to see if the State University and the State Colleges can handle these students and encourage them?

MR. DUNGAN: Oh, I hope I made that clear in my comments to the Committee. I definitely believe that each institution in the State, private and public, ought to be taking a percentage of the so-called disadvantaged for a variety of reasons.

I do not mean to suggest at all that this be the exclusive prerogative or responsibility of the community college.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILENTZ: The fear has been expressed, and it obviously makes some sense since two students can't occupy the same seat, that the admission of disadvantaged students will render the advantaged less advantaged, in a sense. And I wonder, is that the real danger here in New Jersey or are the percentages, for instance of Black students that are in institutions of higher education still the thing we should be focusing on? Do you know what those percentages are?

MR. DUNGAN: Yes. They are creeping up from a low of two when a survey was made by the Federal Government, roughly 2, throughout the institutions in the State, to a more respectable 3 to 5 and even higher in some institutions newly come on the scene who have made a special effort. But

I would say that the recruitment of minority students, particular Black students, by the universities throughout the Country, and particularly in this State, - I don't think that's a major problem. Any youngster, black or green, who wants an education these days, within reasonable limits and within the limits of our capacities here in the public system, it seems to me can make it. It's a much more open system than it was three years ago, here and elsewhere.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILENTZ: I have no further questions.

SENATOR HIERING: Chancellor, just a couple of other questions.

Actually, we all have the same objective and that is to help the disadvantaged. So it seems to me it's a question of what is the most effective, economical way to help them. How can we help the greatest number?

Now, last year Assemblyman Kean sponsored the EOF bill and there was appropriated \$2.5 million. Now I understand that with that you helped actually 1600 students.

Now, when we talk about the Rutgers Program going into a special program, they use the figure of 875 students and it's going to cost \$3 million. Now it seems to me with an additional \$3 million and the EOF you could help 2,000 students instead of 875. It seems to me also that you could place them in all of our colleges, the community colleges as well as the other colleges with a percentage, as you say, of the disadvantaged.

Now, wouldn't we be much better handling this matter through the EOF instead of having the State University say

just in three cities we're going to spend \$3 million to help 875 students.

MR. DUNGAN: Well I think it would be better, Senator, if I deferred on that one to Dr. Gross. I will say one thing that the \$3 million or \$3.2 million figure that you mention is not exclusively for, I believe, the 875 estimated figure. It's down substantially lower than that. I don't think there's any conflict between the two programs and it may very well be that since one is dealing with an entirely new environment here the cost figures or cost estimates could be off.

The EOF program has not been cheap though. Let me say this: As you know, it's spread among 34 institutions in the State; there is a substantial amount of contributed services on the part of faculties and administrations and indeed scholarships, so as it was calculated to be the EOF program actually grew money out of the bushes, so to speak, usually out of the institutional coffers. Particularly is that true of the independent institutions.

SENATOR HIERING: Are there any other questions?

ASSEMBLYMAN CURCIO: Chancellor, everybody has used the words "educationally disadvantaged." Just who are these educationally disadvantaged? Are they youngsters who can't read or write? Are they youngsters who can't make 400 in their college boards? Just who are these people and what is the criteria that we use to determine whether they are educationally disadvantaged or not?

MR. DUNGAN: Well, Assemblyman Curcio, there certainly is the objective measure of the student's achievement. I think by and large, however, that that has to be associated, to some extent, with the kind of educational background from which the youngster comes. In other words, as far as the EOF student is concerned, the accepting institution has been called on to make that judgment. We have not tried to prescribe it from the center and I think quite appropriately. The institution takes a look at the applicant and says, this young man or woman is highly motivated, has latent talent but came out of an environment, whether an educational or another kind of environment, which made it possible for he or she to attain a reasonable level of achievement necessary to get into college and, therefore, we make the judgment about that human being that we will give an opportunity for him or her to enter the institution.

It's a little difficult, and I know you prefer more precision than I can give you actually to tie down exactly what the definition of a disadvantaged youngster is, educationally disadvantaged. The economic side is a heck of a lot easier. The definition we use is the definition used by the Federal Government, that is with a family income of \$6,000 or less.

ASSEMBLYMAN CURCIO: Obviously there has to be some correlation between the economically disadvantaged and the educationally disadvantaged, as you said.

MR. DUNGAN: Yes.

SENATOR HIERING: Are there any further questions?

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: Chancellor, have you or has your Department been able to make a study of what plans the various State Colleges, and I include Rutgers in that, have for future disorders, what plans they have to handle them or combat them?

MR. DUNGAN: Yes. But I smile a little bit, Mr. Ewing, as it seemed for a while there that all that we were doing, both at the institutional level and at the departmental level, was reviewing plans to cope with disruption or disorder, a situation, I submit, which in many ways cannot be planned for.

I say to you and to the other members of the Committee, as I've said to the Governor, that I do believe that every institution in this State, every public institution, is now as prepared as an institution can be for the kind of exigencies that might arise in the turbulent atmosphere in which we exist. By that I do not mean to say that everything is going to come out roses in the event a disturbance occurs. It depends on a whole lot of factors which can't be preplanned.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: Well do you feel the firmness within these plans is correct?

MR. DUNGAN: Well, yes. I happen to be, I suppose, personally, more on the hardline side, hard only in the sense that I think one of the difficulties we have had on American campuses is because the rules of the game were not always clear, at least they weren't made explicit. I think they are more clear than many people pretend, but they weren't explicit. They are explicit in New Jersey today in

our public institutions and, therefore, it seems to me a hardline, I would say a non-violent hardline, is the direction in which we should go and I am confident will, should the unfortunate situation ever arise. We are hoping, and I think all the institutions are moving in the direction of heading off the kinds of difficulties that lead to violence or disruption. One can't be sure of that either, of course.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: Have you or your Department studied or do you have recommendations from the various universities or colleges as to what plans they have for lines of communication between the students, the faculty and the administration, as to what is actually taking place and so on?

MR. DUNGAN: Yes, sir. There have been reports made at our request on the arrangements which now exist or plans that are under way or activities that are under way to change those arrangements.

I think I can say to you that in most cases the institutional arrangements, committee structures, etc. were fair, or fair to good; in some cases, a few, they were not very good. In every case now, however, I would say either that the processes by which student grievances get flushed up and attended to, emphasis on "attended to" in one way or another, up or down, not necessarily up, now either have all been reviewed or are under review and are adequate as far as one can judge. This becomes so very subjective, Mr. Ewing, that what to you and I might

look very systematic and orderly and responsive; to a student who for one reason or another is alienated or really hung up on the administration of the institution, it might be completely inadequate. So all we can say is, we hope that the structures are right.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: Well, are you keeping track of the various colleges as to whether they are actually holding meetings with the students and faculty and administration or are they just giving you a plan and you don't know whether they are following through with it?

MR. DUNGAN: Well, as a matter of fact, we don't on a systematic basis say to Rutgers, for instance, when was the last time you had a meeting with your student body or with the student government leaders or the editors of the paper or whatever other group. And I think the situation is clear as to what the Board of Higher Education believes should be the mode of operation and we depend on intelligent people who are running those institutions to follow in that mode, and I think that's quite appropriate. You may not. Contrary to the opinion held by some, I don't pretend nor want to be a czar.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: Yes, but so much of life you can't take for granted and I think this is such a serious situation, maybe you hope certain bodies are strong enough that they will follow through but if they don't, then we're going to be in the soup again, and the education is the most important part.

MR. DUNGAN: That's true. I agree with what you're

saying there that it is a responsibility of a State coordinating bodies, supervising bodies, such as the Board and the Department are, to maintain a watchful eye. I happen to believe, however, that until such time as it is clearly indicated that the institutions are not capable of moving on their own on important questions like this one, then we ought to stay out, and we try to.

ASSEMBLYMAN ERWIN: What would be your feeling if something was done so that a non-voting member of the student body could be a member of the Board of Trustees in each institution?

MR. DUNGAN: I've had that question put to me a number of times.

I think there are many other and better ways to involve students, legitimate student opinion, in the affairs of the institution. In a certain sense I believe that it burdens a student well beyond what he ought to be burdened with to put him on a board of governors or a board of trustees. I don't feel that terribly strongly on the question. I feel this is the kind of reaction that sets in in the kind of extreme exigency in which we find ourselves that might not be useful in the long run. And I don't mean here to be patronizing at all to students; I happen to think that many students that I know would be much superior to many trustees that I've met - not in this State, of course. But I think there is a question that student status is student status. A trustee has a much different responsibility and I am not always sure that

the two responsibilities are consistent with one another.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: Well what are some of your recommendations - you said you had some thoughts on this other than putting a --

MR. DUNGAN: Oh, I certainly believe that students, for instance, ought to be much more formally involved than they tend to be in the institutions in an operative sense in input on curriculum. Some of my faculty friends who are in the back will not think it such a good idea if I suggest to you that I think they ought to be in in a more formal way than they are now in evaluating faculty. After all, they are the consumers and there is hardly any other enterprise that I know of that is less subject to consumer pressures than the academic enterprise is.

So I think we can find ways through committee structures, and otherwise. And in some institutions the students have found very effective means of making their opinions felt on faculty, for instance. So I think basically every institution, Assemblyman Ewing, has to work out its own method for involving student opinion in some of the most important subjects faced by the community.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: Well, have you given this thought over to the other colleges and have you made recommendations to them, or suggestions, not recommendations?

MR. DUNGAN: Well, from the very beginning, long before there was disruption here, the Board of Higher Education I think in one of its first formal statements suggested to the institutions that they definitely find

ways and means of involving students. I must in all candor say to you that it came out so early in its life and so early in the lives of particularly the state colleges who were just then getting trustees and it may very well bear repetition.

Incidentally, there are forums now springing up on the point you're making in some universities in the country where there is a much more conscious and deliberate effort to restructure certain of the governing bodies of institutions by involving students and faculty, junior and graduate students, all different kinds in the community in recognition that no longer is the American university the exclusive preserve of the trustee and the administrator or even of the faculty. So that I think probably, as I say, according to its own norms of growth - and I think this is a very important point, one that would argue against the thrust of some of your questions - it's not desirable for it to come out of a central agency, whether a legislature or a department, other than the idea. It is up to the institution, according to its pace, its understanding of itself, in accordance with its nature, to develop those structures which will best yield the results which it wants, including in the area of government.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: Well have any of the institutions under your jurisdiction followed through with any of these suggestions that were brought out a long time ago by your Board?

MR. DUNGAN: Oh, sure. For instance, at the State University, as early as a year ago last April the Board of

Trustees was in -- I think Dr. Gross would have to comment upon this - probably more extensive conversation, - the Board of Governors, I said Trustees, - more extensive conversations than at any time in its history with representatives of the student body. And I think there has always been a good relationship, as far as I can tell, at the University with students, if that's your question. But I think it's probably stronger now than it may have been in the past, partly due to circumstances.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: Well what about the State Colleges? Are they following through on the recommendations?

MR. DUNGAN: Clearly at the State Colleges we're in the period of, shall I say, student awakening, when we move, I think, from what one accrediting agency called a high school atmosphere at one of our colleges, into a much more mature collegiate type atmosphere in which students are, sometimes to my dismay, in a very active position on all sorts of questions, some about which they know something and some about which they know little.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: Thank you.

SENATOR HIERING: Anything further?

ASSEMBLYMAN CURCIO: Chancellor, just one more question to clarify my thinking on the question I asked before. Did I understand you to say that it should be left to each institution to make the determination or the judgment as to who is educationally disadvantaged and should come in under this program?

MR. DUNGAN: This is under the ground rules of

the Educational Opportunity Fund Program. That is right. A student applies to the institution and says, I'm applying under the EOF program. That means that the institution then is faced with the obligation of examining this young man or woman's record and saying, yes, you're eligible within the broad outline established by the Board and the legislation.

ASSEMBLYMAN CURCIO: Well, what specifically is the criteria that they use to determine whether he is disadvantaged or not? Is it not possible that one institution may say a particular individual is disadvantaged and therefore can come into the program and another institution that is 30 or 40 miles away may say, you are not, you do not meet the standards or you do not qualify?

MR. DUNGAN: Yes. I think as a theoretical matter that would be possible but I think as a practical matter it is rather unlikely.

When you are talking about any kind of measurement of achievement of a young man applying for college, or woman, you're in a very shakey area where precision is not so easy to come by. The most striking characteristic, I suppose, of educational disadvantage, if that's the word, would be failure to show achievement in standardized tests, the SAT scores, or not having completed successfully the regular college curriculum or the college prep curriculum that would be satisfactory to the receiving institution.

But you are right in interpreting my comment that the basic adjudicator, if you will, of educational disadvantage is the institution within guidelines

established by the EOF Board and under the terms of the statute itself.

ASSEMBLYMAN CURCIO: What are those guidelines? In other words, I would still like to have an answer if I may or if you can as to just what are these guidelines. What is the admissions officer going to look at, what is he going to listen to, what is he going to do to determine whether this young man or young woman gets in or not?

MR. DUNGAN: Not otherwise admissible to a college. Not otherwise admissible. That is, not having achieved on high school records, being in the low position in his or her class, not having been able to achieve at a satisfactory level on the SAT score. And, most likely, coming out of an environment, an educational environment, a school system which made it difficult for that youngster to have attained.

The youngster probably also would have, in coming to the institution, the recommendation of someone who knew him well, a high school teacher or principal, a member of his community who would say, this kid hasn't performed according to the normal rules but he has high potential for the accomplishment of college work in my opinion. That would be a good bet, high risk student, I would say.

ASSEMBLYMAN CURCIO: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: Just one final question, Chancellor. You said in your report to the Legislature that the present administrative arrangements between Newark and New Brunswick were impossible by any reasonable standards. Now, if that is your belief, and I assume it is,

what is there that your office can do to make this a better situation?

MR. DUNGAN: Well, I think it would be undesirable for the office, as such, that is the Department of Higher Education, to step in and try to fix up anybody's administrative rights.

I do think, as a member of the Board of Governors, I have a responsibility, along with the other members, - a responsibility which I must say the Board is now and has been, well before that report, exercising together with the administration and faculty, that is, to take a look at the whole structure of the University, which has grown so greatly in the past decade.

It's not surprising at all to me and I didn't really think that was such a shocking statement; indeed, I didn't even think it was superficial, that the situation would be as such. But I think I also said in that report that you can probably say that of other large state institutions in the same way that have grown as rapidly as Rutgers has. To say it is not to condemn it, it is just to point it out as a fact of life. And there are others who disagree, of course.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: But you don't think there is anything your Department can do to help that situation along.

MR. DUNGAN: I don't think there is anything that the Department should do. Let's put it that way.

SENATOR HIERING: Anything further by the members?

I would like to report that Assemblyman Owens has

joined us. He is sitting to the right of Mrs. Margetts.

Thank you, Chancellor.

After an hour and a half of testimony, I think our secretaries are entitled to a ten minute recess, so we will recess for ten minutes.

(Recess)

SENATOR HIERING: The meeting will now come to order.

Our next witness will be Dr. Mason Gross.

Would you like to proceed now, Doctor?

Do you have a prepared statement or are you just going to --

DR. GROSS: I have no prepared statement. I am prepared to answer any questions or perhaps just to make an introductory statement about the urban program.

SENATOR HIERING: All right, fine. You may proceed.

D R. M A S O N G R O S S: I think just to put this urban program in focus I want to call attention to the name. I think traditionally in American History we found a lot of colleges and universities growing up in cities, and while they were universities in cities they, for the most part, couldn't care less about the environment in which they found themselves. This perhaps came to a classic head in the case of Columbia and the gymnasium - whether that's fair or not, I don't know, but clearly here there seems to be a university which was at war with its neighborhood and not very concerned about it at all.

I don't think that the University necessarily can be blamed for this; this has been a matter of history beyond

their control. But they haven't really considered themselves, what we now would like to consider ourselves, in part at least, an urban university in the most densely populated state in the Union, in the most urbanized state in the Union. It seems to me the fact of being in a city with all the problems of a city is something which a university cannot ignore. And with this program now we are trying to reach out to the inhabitants of those cities as part of the total university program which involves also, of course, the Urban Study Center, the Research Division of the University, the Bureau of Community Activities, the programs which are being developed for urban studies primarily in Livingston College, and so on; the University now not only as a State University but also as an Urban University, is trying to pay more attention, more constructive attention, more helpful attention to the University and to these cities in which it finds itself, and these, of course, are primarily Newark, New Brunswick and Camden. This is one of the reasons why we confined our original program to those cities.

In our research programs, in our community activities, we go way beyond those cities and try to work in any city, any kind of an urban problem in the State, just as for years we have in any agricultural problems.

So I think perhaps this puts a little more into focus as to why we picked those cities as cities where we already had ongoing programs of urban studies and community activities and whatnot.

But I do feel that the most important contribution

that the University can make is for formal education of the people in the cities as elsewhere. Our primary business is education and we feel now that we've got to reach out and see if we can't provide a better system of education for the people who because somehow being in these cities and in the ghetto areas have not had the opportunities that many of the other people in the State have had.

That's just to explain the name Urban University Program and some of the basic philosophy which is behind it. And that's only on one aspect, of course, of this program.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: Dr. Gross, I have a number of questions.

First of all, on the Urban University Program. How is it to be run? Who is going to run it?

DR. GROSS: We expect to have directors of the program in each one of the cities; they, in turn, will be responsible with the faculty, and many of these will be new faculty, specialists in reading, and so on, who will come on to organize the program for the students. It will be done with a maximum amount of individual consultation. We hope in the beginning that perhaps each one of the students can take one of the regular courses leading to a degree. But for the most part these will not be courses for which degree credits will be given; they will be remedial courses, catch-up courses, and whatever you want to call them, and they will be organized within the framework of the colleges but the students will not themselves actually be matriculating for a degree.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: Who are the directors in the three cities?

DR. GROSS: I can't give you the names, sir. I don't think they've been appointed yet.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: They have not been appointed.

DR. GROSS: No. I have my assistant here, John Martin, who has been organizing this program and he will be available to answer any questions of that sort, if you would like.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: How many applications have you had for this program, so far?

DR. GROSS: I will have to defer that to Mr. Martin, too. This will be a recruiting program to go on through the summer. This is not applications in the regular sense of the term. In fact, that was part of our trouble and part of the reason that all of a sudden we came to a near crisis. The University in recent years has been so inundated with applications far beyond what we could take that we never really saw that there was still a further group that would have to be recruited if the opportunity of going on to college was to come to them in any meaningful way at all. And that really is where we fell down, not having enough recruiters. This has now been remedied and we will be conducting an active recruiting campaign. I am happy to say that the students also are doing a great deal of this recruiting to help us out.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: Do you know how many faculty you have recruited to run this program?

DR. GROSS: No, sir. That finally largely will be determined by the number of students, of course.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: You must, though, have hired some people who are actually --

DR. GROSS: Well, could I ask that this be given to Mr. Martin who is in charge? He's here with all of the facts and figures. I don't have them.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: All right. Just out of curiosity, is Dr. Hoff involved in this?

DR. GROSS: No, he's not. He has taken a job at Temple University. He has volunteered to help and he is really living in the area but he is not actually a part of it.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: I saw in the paper yesterday or the day before that you had received from your Board of Trustees a half million dollars to help with this program.

DR. GROSS: We've been authorized to draw against that reserve up to \$500,000.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: How large is that reserve?

DR. GROSS: Well, I really can't tell you. The capital of it is untouchable. This is the accumulated reserve from interest and it's probably in the neighborhood of \$750,000.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: \$750,000?

DR. GROSS: In that neighborhood.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: This is accumulated year by year?

DR. GROSS: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: You don't know how large the full

fund is?

DR. GROSS: The full fund is in the neighborhood of \$4 million, I think, something like that. It's endowed funds.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: What are these monies usually used for?

DR. GROSS: These monies haven't been used; they're being reserved. One of the gifts is a gift toward a concert hall. The amount of money is nothing like sufficient for a concert hall.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: But these are monies put aside for a concert hall?

DR. GROSS: This is like any endowment, gifts given to the University's endowment. Rutgers' endowment has always been very small indeed and the great bulk of it is completely dedicated. For example, our gift of \$2 million from Mrs. Eagleton, which is in the endowment, interest has to go to support the Eagleton Institute, and things of that sort.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: All right. A question has come up or been implied, certainly, about a possible duplication of services in the area of remedial work with the Essex County Community College. Would you like to comment on that?

DR. GROSS: Well, this program will exist just as long as it's needed. In other words, if the Community Colleges and the State Colleges, in their areas, can do the job then there is no reason why we should do it unless there is a specific demand for it. I think there are a certain

number of people available, many of whom would prefer to go to the Essex Community College and some would prefer to go to the University because of the further programs which the University offers, and they will need some of this help. So I imagine we will always have some of it with us but I can't really tell you what the numbers will be.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: Where a student has a choice - in the City of Newark presumably every high school student who is disadvantaged will now have some choice -

DR. GROSS: That's right.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: Why would he choose not to go to Rutgers?

DR. GROSS: Pardon me?

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: Can you think of any reason why a student would choose not to go to Rutgers and go to Essex County Community College, for instance, instead?

DR. GROSS: No, unless there is a fear of their being sent into a purely technical program. Now that may not be true but they might be afraid of it.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: Getting on to a different subject, and maybe again I should ask the Director of the Program as to the faculties for the program. Are they going to be part of the faculty of the University, members of the faculty senate, with full privileges?

DR. GROSS: These particulars haven't been worked out yet.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: On another subject, then. Rutgers' commitment as an Urban University, most of her urban programs

are going to be, I gather, in New Brunswick.

DR. GROSS: Well, the office for the Urban Study Center is in New Brunswick.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: Wouldn't it be more logical to have that office moved to Newark?

DR. GROSS: I can't see why. We are studying the problems of the Urban Centers throughout the State. I mean, this is a practical question. One reason why they want to be in New Brunswick now is because that is the largest library, for example, for their set-up for research purposes. I can't see that it makes any difference whether they work where they are so long as those facilities are available to them. They actually operate on the problems of the entire State of New Jersey.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: Well my question implied that an Urban Center, outside of a library there, that it might be easier were they in Newark and they would actually see the situation as it existed but I guess it's not that far.

DR. GROSS: It isn't that far, no.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: There has been a good deal of controversy on the allocation of the bond funds, an allocation which was decided by the Rutgers Board of Governors. It has been said, for instance, that 25% of the Rutgers students attend Newark and yet they received only 12% of the bond allocation and, therefore, they feel they are discriminated against, they are being treated unfairly. Now would you like to comment on that?

DR. GROSS: Well I honestly don't see - since we

build new buildings in order to take care of more students, I honestly don't see what the present registration has to do with it. I mean, for example we're building Livingston College which has no students. This doesn't seem to be a particularly relevant argument as to where one should try to take care of the incoming students, the additional numbers of students. And the Board having studied this over a long period of time has come to the conclusion that the Kilmer area, where the land was given to us by the Federal Government on condition we use it for educational purposes, seemed to be the logical place to do this. Now this doesn't mean that we are going to cut down on Newark or on Camden. We are trying to expand in all areas. But this is a kind of balanced program for the entire University.

I would like to point out, this list of buildings, of course, comes from a much longer list, a very much longer list. When the amount of money available from the bond issue was determined and it was gradually broken down through the various State Departments, we received an allocation in terms of the building that we were proposing. It came to a total of about \$52 million and it was designed to build a specific set of buildings. This set was advertised as the way Rutgers would use the bond money if the bond issue were passed. This was passed and this is still the way we proposed to use the bond issue. In other words, the Board of Governors did not change its program. This is the one that was actually approved by the voters.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: Now there is a feeling, and I gather the bond issue was the focal point this year but there has definitely been a feeling - I have editorials here from the papers in Newark and there has definitely been a feeling on the Newark Campus that Newark Rutgers was being treated as a secondclass part of the University. I don't believe - at least if I believe the editorial from the Observer and my contacts with students and faculty members at that institution, this is not an issue which anybody is raising on the outside - it's a very genuine feeling.

Is there anything that you think you can do to erase this feeling which I think is very important?

DR. GROSS: Well I have to tell you that there are some 18 units in the University now, every one of which considers itself a stepchild. Now you have had the benefit of listening to the people from Newark. I would invite you to New Brunswick or to Camden or to some of the professional schools and you will, I am afraid, get the same story, all of which comes back to the fact that we haven't had enough money to meet their demands. We have to ration it out as we can and any one campus seeing its own problems naturally feels it is being poorly treated.

I have had people from Newark come screaming ten years ago. They had an awfully good story to tell. Over this period of time we have spent something like \$35 million and built them at least the beginning of a very fine campus. We've got to move on but Newark is not the only

situation where we have real problems.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: What bothers me - and again I'm going on materials here, for instance from the student paper at Newark, and their accuracy I would assume to be correct but I don't have any complete knowledge of that fact but it mentions here, for instance, that when the Board did take the trouble to come and tour the Newark Campus and have their meeting there the result was an appropriation for \$170,000 for the purchase of a hockey rink.

DR. GROSS: I'm happy to inform you, sir, there is not now nor has there ever been a hockey rink.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: An ice skating rink?

DR. GROSS: Ice skating rink or anything of that sort. It was mentioned at one building and turned down hard.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: As far as communications between Rutgers and the six community colleges - not six now but more community colleges - as far as students who might wish to transfer, some being disadvantaged and some not, do you feel within the present plans that the University will be able to accommodate many of those people? What are your future plans?

DR. GROSS: It is going to be very hard to. As you know, the dropout rate these days is very low and people who say, well you get enough dropouts that you can pick these people up, don't understand how the University's Admission programs work. The only way in which we could really save a lot of spaces would be to cut down on our own entering freshman class and two years later there would be

fewer people there. And this becomes very difficult indeed when you try to decide how you are going to do it because many times you will be turning down kids with the higher potentialities as far as their records will show. It's very touchy and difficult.

The thrust of our Director of Admissions has been to keep in constant contact with the schools. They have meetings. And see if we can't do this without overstructuring it; in other words see if we really can't take in as many as there are.

We don't really yet know what the dimensions of the problem are. Last year I believe in New Brunswick we took one-third of the people who applied. But I haven't heard any screams of distress that the others couldn't get in anywhere else. It could be true; I don't know.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN; I've seen in the papers a number of figures quoted for the amount of money you thought your Urban University Program would cost. Could you give me the most authoritative figure?

DR. GROSS: Well, as of the present moment, - there are actually three programs involved; the main one is the Urban University Program for these three cities and that will cost now probably around \$1.8 million; on top of that we have the Rutgers College Transitional Year Program which, when it is combined with the other one somewhat cuts down its expenses and we expect we will have to have an additional \$150,000 to that; and then there is money still that we are trying to find to enrich the summer programs previous to

the kids coming in. So the total is something just under \$2 million.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: You mean and these other --

DR. GROSS: The others are all parts in their ways to supplement this same type of program. The thrust is the same throughout.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: How is the financing coming?

DR. GROSS: Not what you read in the papers.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: Not well, in other words.

DR. GROSS: No, we have \$500,000.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: You have \$500,000 but that's not \$1.8 million.

DR. GROSS: No. I very much hope to be able to present this thing to the Legislature in the hopes of a supplemental appropriation. I do think this is a State program.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: The only thing, well, how was this decision arrived at for the Urban University Program?

DR. GROSS: Well there were various things, of course. What happened in the troubles in Newark was a clear indication that the admission program was altogether too limited in this direction and something ought to be done. That started us all thinking. We had the letter from the Board of Higher Education, signed by Mr. Booher, urging us all to think in terms of education of the economically disadvantaged. And at a meeting on March 14th in New Brunswick the Board of Governors, in Executive Session with Mr. Dungan there, we hammered out that particular policy.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: This sprung out of a meeting.

DR. GROSS: It came from a meeting of the Board of Governors, yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: It was not a Committee that came up with recommendations.

DR. GROSS: No, a full meeting in executive session.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: Well, I think it's obvious that probably some of the financing difficulties may have come, but this was not a program -- I can see the reason why it wasn't but it wasn't a program which came out of a natural development of - through normal processes, in other words. This was something that came out suddenly without prior consultation with --

DR. GROSS: With anybody, except the Board. That's correct, yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: Yes, the Board consulted among themselves; I mean there wasn't any consultation outside.

DR. GROSS: No. I mean, we all had known for some time that something ought to be done. We tried to increase our enrollment for the minority group, we tried to include them, and so on, but what was obviously needed was a crash program of some sort. And the determination to find it by limiting it to these three cities all of a sudden made the program possible. We couldn't do this on a statewide basis. It would be absolutely impossible to conceive of anything of that sort. But in terms of these three cities we had our particular community responsibilities and we felt it could be done as a start.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: As you may imagine, coming from Essex County, the reaction of those who live in Irvington and East Orange and Bloomfield, in some cases within a matter of blocks of the City of Newark, is not in favor of this program.

DR. GROSS: I can see that. I think all we can say is, we are taking care of more than we ever have before. I see no reason why we can't work with the State Board, the State Colleges, the Community Colleges to increase it. It should be increased. This is only a start.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: But the problem comes that these people - and this is as much a matter of snobbishness as the Chancellor mentioned, but these people want to go to Rutgers, basically, they don't want to go to a State College, because it is a fine university and has a lot of prestige here.

DR. GROSS: Well then we have got to sit down with the Legislature and talk large sums of money, not small sums.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: Would you like to comment and give your reasons for or against the Chancellor's recommendation for cutting Newark off and making it into a separate university?

DR. GROSS: Well I am sure the Chancellor will be annoyed with me if I don't say at this point, it is not a recommendation yet, it's a recommendation that this problem be studied.

You will recall that this recommendation was first made about five years ago in the First Governor's Special

Committee Report on Higher Education, the report which Dr. Carol Newsome wrote, as Chairman of the Committee, and we have been considering this and studying this for some time.

I am not sure what the sentiment throughout Newark is. I know that most of the schools up there so far have on their own volition registered with me their dismay at the thought of being separated. I have not heard from the College of Arts and Sciences. I think they are studying the thing quite closely. The professional schools, particularly, do not want to be separated from the University.

Now we are open on this thing. We've been studying it. Obviously we want to run the best kind of University that we can and provide the best quality of education. If that's the way to do it, okeh, but I think there are a lot of implications here. I mean, who then works out the budgets and so on? It's out of the hands of the University. Maybe that's the way it should be. We don't have any dead set against it by any means and we think it should be studied.

I should add now that we're also studying - well, we have a Committee of the Board of Governors and Trustees studying the internal organization of the University.

When the Chancellor referred to the present setup as being impossible, I was a little surprised. It isn't working perfectly by any means and there have been all kinds of remedies suggested which are being studied. But it has worked for 23 years and has done quite a lot, I think. So it isn't really as impossible as it sounds, but it has to

be improved; there is no question about that. As these colleges have grown bigger, as their needs have grown greater, and so on, they should have more direct attention, I think, on a higher level.

SENATOR HIERING: Any further questions?

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: Dr. Gross, as you know, at the time of the civil disruptions at Rutgers the educational process at Rutgers became more or less a public issue more than a University issue because of the outrage of the public in the State of New Jersey in relationship to the behavior of the students at Rutgers and to the handling of the situation by, in thier opinion and by many, Dr. Talbott and yourself, and at that time I proposed an investigation of the University because of so many concerned citizens contacting me in their behalf to look into the matter. And, as you will recall, which was not too long ago, there was a group of students on the campus at Rutgers who decided that the policy at Rutgers University was not satisfactory to them and illegally seized a building or two, and at other campuses in Camden, which in my opinion led to further disorders across the State in the public schools of New Jersey, also took the method of disrupting the educational process and superseded the normal channels of communication which had been the ordinary for many, many years. And at that time there were many, many questions, important to me as a Legislator, that I asked you at another particular meeting at which the Education Committee met with you, and although I say that your aims to involve the Rutgers

University with the urban community's problem would be a very noble task, probably a very courageous task, but in thinking of expanding our programs at our universities the people that support Rutgers University are the taxpayers of this State.

Very basically, I don't feel that the citizens of New Jersey will be in approval of students disrupting the educational process.

And, while I'm speaking of these matters, I would like to again ask you some very important questions because there seems to be not only in New Jersey but across the nation a pattern for decision-making of many university heads across our country that when students seize a public building, when they threaten students on the campus and faculty members, that the university officials who are responsible for that university are not taking firm and forceful action in evaluating, which is important, but also in maintaining a normal atmosphere at our universities.

Now I would like to say to you at this point, ask you a question, if you could list for me now what laws were broken because I don't think there was ever a clear status of those laws that were broken at Rutgers University, item by item - if you can recollect what laws, exactly, were broken on Rutgers University property.

DR. GROSS: Well, I am not a lawyer, sir. I can't answer that. Certainly the students seized a building, Conklin Hall in Newark, and held it for approximately 72 hours, and in Camden seized the public center and held it

for roughly 13 1/2 hours.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: Well, I know you are not a lawyer but you are President of Rutgers University in the State of New Jersey and you are ultimately responsible, whether it be your fault or not, for anything that is disrupted, bad or good, at our universities. And I again state my question whether or not there were any laws broken and, if so, - I will extend the question - what did you do in these events when these laws were broken? What action did you take?

DR. GROSS: Well, the first action, of course, was to get in touch with the police and to discuss with them what the better procedure was.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: And is it true - who did contact the police in Newark?

DR. GROSS: I spoke to the precinct captain myself in Mr. Talbott's office. Mr. Talbott was in constant touch with the Police Commissioner, Mr. Spinna.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: And was it your belief that the police were better off the campus than on.

DR. GROSS: Yes, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: And did you instruct the police to stay off the campus?

DR. GROSS: The police told us that they would not come on unless we called them on.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: All right. Was this due to any prior situation that had come about before this disruption that broke out and which the public knew about?

In other words, this policy of keeping police off the campus, did this just come about out of the clear blue sky or did you and Dr. Talbott develop this policy at the outbreak, the last outbreak at Rutgers?

DR. GROSS: Well, I am still not quite sure that I understand the question. It wasn't a question of keeping the police off the campus, it was not calling them on to the campus.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: Well it seems to me that we don't have a clear picture of all the laws that were broken and, of course, I'm not a police officer or a lawyer but I'm asking you because I feel that you are responsible and I think a lot of people feel that you are responsible for what goes on at Rutgers University. And when a building is illegally seized, I'm sure that the law of the State of New Jersey has been broken. I am sure if you checked with the Law School that you have, a very qualified law school, on the Newark Campus, that you would be able to find out whether or not any of the statutes were broken in the State of New Jersey when students take the law into their own hands.

Secondly, these students that did take the law into their own hands disrupted the normal process of education for many, many other students on Rutgers Campus. And in so doing, they interfered with the constitutional rights of the other students that are attending Rutgers University.

And in talking of this very controversial subject, it seems to be a reluctant one for some, I would say that

the general image of Rutgers has been degraded because of the situation, how it was handled by you and by Malcolm Talbott. And in recalling, on the eve of these negotiations between yourself, Malcolm Talbott and the students at Rutgers, - if I am incorrect I will give you the opportunity to correct me - there was a conversation tape signed by you at five o'clock in the morning that was sent to you by courier, under the instruction of Malcolm Talbott, and you agreed to many, many things that were in this tape that was handed over to the Chairman of this Committee.

Could you tell me what agreements you had reached when you signed this contract between yourself and the students at Rutgers University, the students that took over the Campus?

DR. GROSS: I said then and I said at the time that I was signing those things simply as evidence that they were parts of the discussion. I signed no agreement as such. I have to admit that there was some misunderstanding but the one agreement that I was supposed to have signed was one that I tried to persuade the students all along could not be signed. I had no authority as President of the University to sign any such agreement, the matter was a matter for the faculty.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: Well who advised you to sign this tape, this conversation tape, contract or discussion tape?

DR. GROSS: Mr. Talbott seemed to feel that to acknowledge those papers was a way of winding up the

affair that evening. He was under no impression it was an agreement on it.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: Is Mr. Talbott a lawyer?

DR. GROSS: Mr. Talbott is a lawyer.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: And he acted as an advisor or as a President of the University or as an attorney in your behalf.

DR. GROSS: I didn't question him on that. I asked Mr. Talbott.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: In other words, when these negotiations took place, Mr. Talbott instructed you and negotiated with the students at the same time.

DR. GROSS: Well I had been present at all the negotiations. We thought they were over and I had gone home.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: Well did you feel that there was anything alarming about a tape coming to your house at 5 o'clock in the morning?

DR. GROSS: No. Incidentally, sir, the tape is not important. The tape --

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: I believe the tape was important because I think your signature went on it.

DR. GROSS: The tape was simply a record of a conversation. There was no agreement in that.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: All right. Then since then, since the discussion tape had been signed, or whatever you would like to call it, have any of the things that had been discussed between the BOS or students that were

representing the students that took over Rutgers University come to pass or any policy formed from these negotiations?

DR. GROSS: On that particular evening, what the students hoped we would sign would be an agreement to take all the Black students from the Newark High Schools in the top half of their class. We indicated that we couldn't do that.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: What I am trying to get at is, have there been any developments that have come out of this conversation tape as part of your policy and Mr. Talbott's policy as Presidents of Rutgers University.

DR. GROSS: Have there been any major changes in policy?

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: Yes.

DR. GROSS: No, not from the tape.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: Not from the tape.

DR. GROSS: No, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: Nothing that was discussed on the tape is going to be part of Rutgers University's policy at this point.

DR. GROSS: I can't say that because one of the things we discussed at great length was broadening the basis of admission, and we have done that but not in the way it was discussed in that tape at all.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: Well what about the removal of the Director of Admissions at Rutgers, Mr. Schwab and Mr. Miller?

DR. GROSS: Removal is not the word. He was given

a change of assignment.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: Transfer.

DR. GROSS: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: Was that discussed in that conversation tape?

DR. GROSS: No.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: Well evidently something did change, didn't it?

DR. GROSS: Not as a result of that tape.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: What came about that changed your opinion of these two individuals?

DR. GROSS: It seemed to me that emotions were running so high at that particular point that the office could not effectuate the way it was set up so we simply split the office in two parts and assigned offices to each one from the original office.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: Well, was there anything about these two individuals - as far as I'm concerned, from what I hear, - I'm not intimately involved in Rutgers University, that's why I'm asking you - was there anything, before this student take-over that would lend to your thinking that these two individuals should be transferred?

DR. GROSS: They had asked to be transferred, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: They had asked to be transferred and they feel perfectly satisfied that they have been transferred from Rutgers?

DR. GROSS: No. One of them has taken another job elsewhere. The senior one will be coming back when his

military service is over and taking another job in the University.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: How did the students at Rutgers University enter Conklin Hall?

DR. GROSS: They found a guard and got him to open the door.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: They found him. And what did they do?

DR. GROSS: They scared him, I guess you would say, into opening the door for them.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: Did they have any kind of weapon?

DR. GROSS: I believe one was supposed to have had an axe that you find with fire equipment but it was not used.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: It was not used but you said they found a nightwatchman and scared him into leaving the keys.

DR. GROSS: That's right.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: And for how long did they occupy Conklin Hall?

DR. GROSS: Just about 72 hours.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: Were there any members of Rutgers University faculty or staff that aided and abetted the students that were inside Conklin Hall?

DR. GROSS: Not to my knowledge.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: Can you answer another question. How did the students in Rutgers University, Conklin Hall,

receive food?

DR. GROSS: They took it in with them, I believe.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: They took enough food in for 72 hours?

DR. GROSS: I think they said they had taken enough food for two weeks.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: Were there any weapons inside Rutgers University, inside the building?

DR. GROSS: To my knowledge, no.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: Was there any damage done inside Rutgers University?

DR. GROSS: One, I think you can call him a bystander, put his fist through a downstairs window. As far as I know that was the only damage in those three days.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: And in your evaluation, do you feel that the student takeovers added to or was conducive to a good university atmosphere on your Campus?

DR. GROSS: No, I do not.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: And what do you intend doing about it?

DR. GROSS: You mean with a view to preventing future --

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: What would you do if tomorrow the student buildings were seized again? What approach would you take?

DR. GROSS: Well you have got to realize that all of these situations across the country are totally different.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: I'm asking you about Rutgers

University. Right now I am not concerned about across the United States. What would you do as President of Rutgers University if a group of students, black or white, took over a building at your Campus?

DR. GROSS: Sir, I am going to say only that I sense all these situations everywhere, including within the University, are different, that I would evaluate the situation and move as fast as I could to clear the building.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: To clear the building.

DR. GROSS: Yes. But that doesn't necessarily mean call in the police.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: And if the students refused?

DR. GROSS: We're getting into an if world here.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: No, I'm going on history.

I am asking a question on history because of what happened at Rutgers. I can only base your effectiveness as a President of a University in our State on this particular issue and nothing else, on what has happened, not on what is going to happen, because it did happen and I'm not satisfied with your approach. I will question you again, what would you do, what action would you take if tomorrow the students would take over another building at Rutgers.

DR. GROSS: Well I would say, basically, there are only two ways of getting people out of a building; one is by persuasion and the other is by force, and I would want to use persuasion as long as we were getting any response at all. The introduction of force I think has consequences way beyond the immediate action and could be permanently

damaging to the University and to the community around it.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: Well it seems to me that students at Rutgers and, as you said, across the United States have felt that this is the best way for them to gain their demands, their non-negotiable demands, and to allow the presidents of universities to fall under the hammer of militant students instead of taking the normal communications, instead of working within the framework of the university, and no matter what glorified language is used at this point, to say that the Legislature must appropriate additional funds, it's true that the Legislature should appropriate additional funds because there is no doubt that in the State of New Jersey we must provide education for all. But I don't believe that the citizens of our State have to put up with the constant harassment of the university officials, of the students who are trying to do a normal job as a student on a campus, and the citizens of our State do not have to put up with students who feel that there are injustices and this is the way to solve them. There is no doubt that there is much to be desired as far as educating youth in our urban communities but I must say that Mr. Talbott and Dr. Gross, in my opinion, have not handled this situation so that we can deal with it without blackmail, so that we can deal with this problem on the face of its urgency. And I say to you, Dr. Gross, that this is no way to handle the problems of students on our campuses. To fall beneath the hammer of pressure, I think is only lighting the fires of those people who believe that our system is about to fall.

I think the University is probably the strongest institution next to the church in our culture, and I think this is no way for us to conduct ourselves as people in responsible positions.

ASSEMBLYMAN OWENS: Mr. Chairman?

SENATOR HIERING: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN OWENS: I would like to ask a question of the Chair, if I may, just for the purpose of future clarification as to the method of conducting a hearing.

I have assumed that we were gathering information and I wonder if in the future will we permit speeches from the members of the Committee or will we adhere to questions and answers of those who appear before the Committee?

SENATOR HIERING: Well, Assemblyman Owens, let me say this. Basically, we are here inquiring and we are here attempting to get information and we should confine ourselves to asking question to elicit information.

ASSEMBLYMAN OWENS: Well I would request of the Chair that we follow that procedure because it is time consuming, we have a great number of individuals to be heard, and I think if the purpose is to obtain information, then we should stick to asking and answering questions.

SENATOR HIERING: Yes, the point is well taken. I have just asked Assemblyman Caputo to confine his remarks to factual questions.

ASSEMBLYMAN CURCIO: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question of Dr. Gross?

SENATOR HIERING: Certainly.

ASSEMBLYMAN CURCIO: Dr. Gross, it was mentioned by the Chancellor and also by you that you at Rutgers are going into an Urban University Program. I would like, and I think I speak for many people in the State of New Jersey, to find out just what this Urban University Program is to be. Could you succinctly answer that for us, please?

DR. GROSS: Well the statement of policy that was adopted by the Board of Governors, first of all, stated its belief that there should be educational opportunity for all in the State of New Jersey, whatever form of higher education --

ASSEMBLYMAN CURCIO: Now may I interrupt you there. You say educational opportunity for all. By that do you mean a university educational opportunity for all?

DR. GROSS: A post high school education.

ASSEMBLYMAN CURCIO: In other words, every youngster who graduates from high school should then to to a university.

DR. GROSS: No, not necessarily.

ASSEMBLYMAN CURCIO: Well wouldn't that be the interpretation of the word "all"?

DR. GROSS: I didn't say a university education, post high school education for all. This means a whole range of county colleges, state colleges, technical schools, and so on. The opportunity should be there for all to get some form of further education, including the university.

ASSEMBLYMAN CURCIO: All right, then to the specifics. The Urban University Program at Rutgers, I believe this would involve the three cities where Rutgers'

branches are.

DR. GROSS: Correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN CURCIO: Camden, Newark and New Brunswick?

DR. GROSS: Correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN CURCIO: Now is this the disadvantaged program that you spoke of earlier?

DR. GROSS: This is the program for the education of economically disadvantaged students in those cities who hold high school diplomas from those cities.

ASSEMBLYMAN CURCIO: All right. Now, would you explain, if you would, for me what are the criteria to be used to determine who is educationally disadvantaged?

DR. GROSS: As far as we can see now it would be a person whose high school record was not such as to permit him to be accepted in any accredited college --

ASSEMBLYMAN CURCIO: I'm sorry to interrupt you but I can't understand what you're saying. Perhaps the mike isn't loud enough.

DR. GROSS: I'm sorry. We open this up to anybody who -- the educationally disadvantaged people are the people whose high school record has not prepared them for admission to any normal college program, including our own.

ASSEMBLYMAN CURCIO: And this is the recruiting program that you spoke of that will implement the Urban University Program?

DR. GROSS: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN CURCIO: Do I understand then, putting it succinctly, that we are going out to recruit students

who are failures, who are the highest risks in Newark, Camden and New Brunswick, and send them to Rutgers University?

DR. GROSS: Yes, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN CURCIO: Would it not be wiser to get the brightest, the most conscientious, the hardest worker and students with the highest potential and recruit them?

DR. GROSS: We try as hard as we can to do that too.

ASSEMBLYMAN CURCIO: Is this program the result of the seizures of the buildings in Camden and Newark?

DR. GROSS: No, sir, because we have been working on ideas of this sort, trying to recruit more people from these areas, prior to that. These activities have been essentially not very productive and we thought that we must do much more than that and this way of throwing the doors open to people with that type of definition seemed to be a way of at least showing that we were trying to do the job as fully as we could.

ASSEMBLYMAN CURCIO: Will these children be eligible for baccalaureate degrees?

DR. GROSS: They will come in, to use our phrase, as non-matriculating students --

ASSEMBLYMAN CURCIO: As what?

DR. GROSS: As non-matriculating students. In other words, they will not immediately be on the track toward a degree because most of their work will be remedial work or catch-up work below the level of college work. It's when they achieve those levels that then they will be fully matriculated and will go on to a degree.

ASSEMBLYMAN CURCIO: In other words, you will have a high school program at Rutgers University for these students.

DR. GROSS: A remedial program. We've had these in the past, yes, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN CURCIO: And when will these students be eligible for a degree?

DR. GROSS: Well it will certainly take them five years.

ASSEMBLYMAN CURCIO: Five years?

DR. GROSS: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN CURCIO: Will this do anything to the standards at Rutgers University and the status that Rutgers University holds in the educational field?

DR. GROSS: My firm belief is that it will not. They will not be admitted to the regular courses until they are ready for them.

ASSEMBLYMAN CURCIO: Might this same program be conducted elsewhere, other than at Rutgers University?

DR. GROSS: Yes, sir, and I hope it will.

ASSEMBLYMAN CURCIO: The impetus for the adoption or the implementation of this program came about as a result of the seizures of the buildings at two --

DR. GROSS: That's linking things much too closely together. No, sir, it's not.

ASSEMBLYMAN CURCIO: I beg your pardon?

DR. GROSS: That's linking two things much too closely together.

ASSEMBLYMAN CURCIO: Had a program like this been

adopted prior to the seizure of the buildings?

DR. GROSS: No, sir. This is a program that was adopted on the 14th of March.

ASSEMBLYMAN CURCIO: When was the seizure of the building, in February?

DR. GROSS: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN CURCIO: Thank you.

SENATOR DUMONT: Dr. Gross, in a statement which you made over WCBS Radio on May 6th, last, among other things you were quoted as saying, "The new program will be over and above our admissions under the standard requirement; in fact, next fall we will admit the largest freshman class in our history." Now, how large will that class be next September?

DR. GROSS: Across the University, approximately 4200. We have been frozen, more or less, at the level of 3500 for several years but now we are getting some college openings with some of the newer buildings and we hope to take on more people and we will be able to increase our normal quota.

SENATOR DUMONT: Now will those 4200 include approximately 400 or 500 educationally disadvantaged children from Newark, Camden and New Brunswick?

DR. GROSS: If you're talking about this extra group, no, this is over and above that.

SENATOR DUMONT: So that the additional 400 or 500 - I don't know exactly what your figure is that you're planning to take from the three cities - would be over and above the 4200?

DR. GROSS: Yes.

SENATOR DUMONT: You also indicated that one of the reasons that you could do this was that all of those students in the program would be commuters. Is that correct?

DR. GROSS: Correct.

SENATOR DUMONT: So they would be strictly day students.

DR. GROSS: In the Urban University Program, yes.

SENATOR DUMONT: For whom, of course, no housing would be necessary.

DR. GROSS: That's right.

SENATOR DUMONT: Now in the course of admitting the additional 400 or 500 students, will you actually be denying that many spaces to other students from so-called middle-class families who may or who may not need financial assistance to go to Rutgers?

DR. GROSS: Without financial aid, we can't take on this group. Without financial aid, we couldn't increase our other enrollment at all.

SENATOR DUMONT: But will you actually be denying any spaces, which are always in short supply at Rutgers, as it is, to other students by virtue of this new program?

DR. GROSS: Well, Senator, this is a program for increasing the enrollment of the University and it zeroes in an area which we consider to be quite critical from a social and educational point of view. Now, obviously, we could have had a different type of program and zeroed in on another bunch too, which might or might not have gotten the kind of support that we should have had. So, in a sense,

it is not denying it to anybody who currently could be admitted; it could only be if another program of a different type were devised for them.

SENATOR DUMONT: But if you didn't have this program, would you be taking in 400 or 500 students from other backgrounds, let's say, and I don't know exactly what they would be but the type that --

DR. GROSS: Not without another special program, no.

SENATOR DUMONT: You would not be.

DR. GROSS: No, sir.

SENATOR DUMONT: In other words, you would be continuing your normal progression of increasing the size of the class.

DR. GROSS: We hope to increase it again next year, considerably.

SENATOR DUMONT: Is this new program that you are recommending at Rutgers much like the one at College City of New York?

DR. GROSS: I don't know their program, sir.

SENATOR DUMONT: You have, I am sure, particularly since the disorders at Newark and Camden and perhaps before that time, tried to involve the student body, I presume, in more conversations with the administration, faculty, and so forth?

DR. GROSS: Oh, yes.

SENATOR DUMONT: And what exactly are you talking to them about? In other words, how are you trying to involve them in line with any requests that are within reason that

they make, other than you would have if these disorders had not have occurred?

DR. GROSS: Well, we had already started long before that to involve students more and more in faculty committee work, having student-faculty committees, and so on. We have been trying to bring them more and more into the decision-making process. That has been accelerated by this, certainly, and the students have responded magnificently.

SENATOR DUMONT: Are you, as the Chancellor suggested, asking the students to do anything about evaluating the faculty, or is that one of their requests or demands?

DR. GROSS: No. The students published, about a year or so ago, for example, a booklet - this is the College of Arts and Sciences in New Brunswick - evaluating all the courses. It's a very intelligent document. And this was way prior to the affairs of this past winter.

SENATOR DUMONT: Have you implemented any parts of that?

DR. GROSS: Well this is an evaluation of what they are. This is not a recommendation that they be fired, let's say, but this certainly takes in the evaluation of the department chairmen and so on and recommending people for reappointment, promotion and whatnot.

SENATOR DUMONT: Now I understood you to say that the cost of the new program would be roughly \$2 million. Is that correct?

DR. GROSS: Yes, I did.

SENATOR DUMONT: Chancellor Dungan said something

that he had understood - I don't think he said this as a matter of fact, that he understood it would cost about \$2.7 million.

DR. GROSS: Well we have tried to cut it down. We have been hammering away at that thing and cutting that \$2.7. The original bill was something like \$3.4 million. We've cut that way back and now the \$2.7 million roughly has gone to \$1.8 million and we have been able to catch up some of the others in the \$1.8 million so that the total bill now will be approximately \$2 million.

SENATOR DUMONT: Approximately \$2 million.

DR. GROSS: Yes.

SENATOR DUMONT: Would that be reduced by this half million that you are making available out of reserves to, say, \$1.5 million?

DR. GROSS: No, the cost is still \$2 million.

SENATOR DUMONT: In spite of the use of that reserve.

DR. GROSS: I mean that was there to help pay off part of the cost.

SENATOR DUMONT: Right. What have you done about consulting, with respect to this new program, in connection with your body of alumni? I seem to recall having received a letter about a month ago, and I can't locate it today, from someone whom I thought described himself as President of the Alumni Association, rather critical of the new program.

DR. GROSS: I'm happy to say he's here today too if you wish to speak to him. The response from the alumni

has been tremendously varied, from enthusiasm to utter despair and with all the shades that can be taken in between.

SENATOR DUMONT: Mr. William A. Jeney, is it?

DR. GROSS: Mr. Jeney.

SENATOR DUMONT: Mr. Jeney, Class of '53. And he is here today and he will testify in his own behalf or in behalf of the Alumni?

DR. GROSS: I assume that's why he's here. He was invited.

SENATOR DUMONT: All right. Now Mr. Schwab who was transferred out of Newark, as I recall, made a statement to the effect that he thought the policy with regard to admission of students, as it was being pursued on the Newark Campus, was actually discriminating against Black students. Did he make such a statement?

DR. GROSS: I'm not aware of that, Senator.

SENATOR DUMONT: Well that's the way I recall the newspaper having quoted him at the time.

Where is Mr. Schwab now?

DR. GROSS: He's in military camp, sir. He's a reserve officer.

SENATOR DUMONT: Whereabouts?

DR. GROSS: I don't know where.

SENATOR DUMONT: Temporary or permanent?

DR. GROSS: The two weeks.

SENATOR SUMONT: You say he's going to have a new assignment at Rutgers when he returns?

DR. GROSS: Yes, sir.

SENATOR DUMONT: And what will that be?

DR. GROSS: Associate Dean of University College in charge of placement and other assignments as they come along.

SENATOR DUMONT: Where would he be then, New Brunswick?

DR. GROSS: His base will be New Brunswick. University College operates in five cities but the central administrative base is New Brunswick.

SENATOR DUMONT: Is this a demotion from his previous job?

DR. GROSS: No, sir.

SENATOR DUMONT: Would you consider it a promotion or simply a lateral transfer?

DR. GROSS: It's a lateral transfer. He'll get a better salary because of increments and so on.

SENATOR DUMONT: What has happened with respect to Mr. Miller?

DR. GROSS: Mr. Miller, as far as I know, has resigned from the University. I don't know where he is now.

SENATOR DUMONT: What about the other people who were in that Admissions Office in Newark all of whom, as I recall, were said to have tendered their resignations at the time because of the fact that this happened with Mr. Schwab and Mr. Miller? Are they still employed by the University or have they been transferred?

DR. GROSS: I can't tell you. They were all asked back. I can't tell you where they are but I can get that information for you, so far as we know.

SENATOR DUMONT: You feel, I take it, that there will be no reduction in the standards of the University or what you require to be pursued in order to attain a degree as a result of the new policy and new program.

DR. GROSS: The standards for the degree haven't been affected in any way at all and will not be.

SENATOR DUMONT: Thank you.

SENATOR HIERING: Assemblyman Wilentz?

ASSEMBLYMAN WILENTZ: Doctor Gross, do you have any views about the suggestion that some people have made that the disadvantaged should be handled primarily through the county college system rather than the university or the state colleges?

DR. GROSS: Well, I think a lot of the thinking which has been going on in the State has been affected by the California plan where the top 12 per cent roughly go to the university and the top 40 per cent to the state colleges, and the rest to the community colleges. At least that's possible enrollment for them. Our feeling has been, and I think the feeling in California is that this is altogether too rigid, that you've got to allow much more choice to the different people as to where they want to go. You mustn't say that you must go to a community college and this is the best you can do, or you must do something else. The opportunity should be open at all places for all types of students if they feel that they can profit by it and this is where their motivation is, etc, and we shouldn't have rigid standards of pushing them off to this, that, and the other type institution. So I think that probably the community college will bear the great burden of this, but I certainly feel that the State University and the State colleges should have programs of this sort for those students who feel that that is what opportunity means to them.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILENTZ: So that Rutgers' involvement in this program is not, from your point of view anyway, a temporary matter or temporary measure that you're in this for keeps?

DR. GROSS: Well, I hope it's temporary because I hope there will be fewer and fewer of these people coming up through the school system.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILENTZ: But only to that extent would it be temporary.

You mentioned, in answer to a question, this problem of county college transfer students and the problem it causes to Rutgers and the fact if you are going to take them in the third year you've got to leave spaces vacant in the first two years. Do you have any views on the proper solution to that transfer problem?

DR. GROSS: I think it's a terribly tough one but I think again it comes down to a question of space. We could, I suppose, design additional space. I'd hate to cut back on what we're doing now. We could design additional space to accommodate these people.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILENTZ: You mean, special space for these -

DR. GROSS: No, just additional space. You wouldn't want to have them all in one special area. I think that would be bad, but it would have to be thought of as additional space earmarked for that type of increase.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILENTZ: And would that necessarily create this imbalance in space between first and second-year students on the one hand, and third and fourth-year students on the other?

DR. GROSS: It's going to mean that the third and fourth years, and particularly, as was suggested, those who go on for an M.A. degree. This will certainly mean that

those classes will become larger than they have been in relation to the freshman and sophomore years.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILENTZ: Do you have any view which would indicate a preference for expanding the county college system itself to a four-year system or -

DR. GROSS: I wouldn't do that now; I would be against that as of now. It may turn out that that's what's needed. In some places, you know, they've decided to have what they call senior colleges, to take the last two years only. Florida has a couple of these. This is one way perhaps.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILENTZ: From your figures, I gather you are going to need about one and a half million dollars more for this.

DR. GROSS: The cost is two million.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILENTZ: Right, You indicated you apparently at least had available \$500,000.

DR. GROSS: We are calling this seed money.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILENTZ: Do you have any plan as to when you are going to make this request of the Legislature?

DR. GROSS: I don't know what your schedule is. I will certainly work with Mr. Dungan because our request goes through the Board of Higher Education by law, and whatever the appropriate time is, we will move. The sooner the better, so far as I'm concerned.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILENTZ: I would assume it is not only our schedule but there might be a time when you need the money.

DR. GROSS: Well, we need the money right now because we are going to have to start hiring people as of the 1st of July, and that's why this particular contribution by the Board of Trustees was so vital to us.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILENTZ: I think that one of the things that disturbs many people more than the policy which Rutgers adopted was the timing of the policy and the concern that many people have that the student disturbance is a thing that has become and can become more so an imitative pattern, both in high schools and colleges. Have you any indication at Rutgers from what occurred at the time of the seizure of the building and what happened subsequently as to the mood of the students at Rutgers? I'm not asking for any guarantee that something is not going to happen in the future, which you, of course, could not guarantee, but do you have any indication of the present mood and relationship of the student body at Rutgers to the administration; that is, either hopeful or not hopeful?

DR. GROSS: Well, you say the student mood and relationship to the administration - I don't think that's it. The question is how is the community functioning - the administration, faculty, and students? I can't speak equally competently for all the campuses but I would say generally speaking we probably have a higher level of morale now on most campuses than we have ever had.

SENATOR HIERING: Are there any further questions?

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: Dr. Gross, if the money is not coming from the Legislature, I think the statement was made

by the Board of Trustees that they would provide it anyway.
Is this true, or am I misinformed?

DR. GROSS: Well, what they have done is to authorize the Executive Committee to permit the Board of Governors to draw on this fund up to \$500,000.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: And if you get nothing more than the \$500,000 the program would be curtailed to fit the \$500,000?

DR. GROSS: They couldn't carry us through the year. They haven't got money enough.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: Would they do a small part of the program for \$500,000 or nothing at all?

DR. GROSS: I don't think that's the way. I think we have to be confident we are going to get this money and will get relief from the Legislature. We will not be able to survive the year without it. We would have to just cut it off and that would be catastrophic, I think.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: Of the community colleges that are now operating, are there any that Rutgers will not accept transfer students from?

DR. GROSS: No, sir, we have no such criteria.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: You take them from all community colleges now?

DR. GROSS: As far as we can. It's a question of numbers and space not a question of the character of any given community college.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: No, but the academic standing of each one of the community colleges is sufficient to make them transfer colleges?

DR. GROSS: We would have to consider it. I really don't quite understand your meaning. Have we got a blacklist of some community colleges? No.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: As I understand it, there are some community colleges that maybe do not have studies set up for a transfer program. Their academic standards are not that.

DR. GROSS: I don't know this, Mr. Ewing. In any case, we would take it student by student rather than in block groups of any sort.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: Also what is your feeling about the feasibility of having a student as a non-voting member of the Board of Governors?

DR. GROSS: This is again being studied by the committee we have now. The whole question of the composition of the Board of Governors and the Board of Trustees is being studied. One member of the Board specifically asked them to consider the question of having not only student representation but also faculty representation on the Boards, and this is under study.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: Well, if they haven't, I recommend that somebody contact Governor Nunn of Kentucky in this process, as they have one of these students on their Board.

DR. GROSS: Yes, I know. Quite a number do and we want to find out how it works.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: Since we had lunch several months ago, I was wondering what further was being done toward having group discussions with faculty and students and administration, as far as what possible problems might be forthcoming or -

DR. GROSS: A tremendous amount of this is going on.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: It's an on-going program and constantly there, so in other words we should hear no complaints from students at any time that they are not being able to be heard or get their ideas across - not that they have to be accepted but at least -

DR. GROSS: No, there are channels of communication there which I think are better than they have ever been. I won't guarantee you won't get complaints but -

SENATOR HIERING: Assemblyman Curcio?

ASSEMBLYMAN CURCIO: One more question. Doctor Gross, is the university planning to recruit students who have graduated from two-year program community colleges?

DR. GROSS: No, we are not. I don't think we have any plan to do that; on the other hand, we don't need to. The heads of the community colleges are very anxious to place their students so they are in touch with us all the time, not only about actual students but possible numbers. So I don't think recruiting is going to be necessary there.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: Something you said previously, Dr. Gross. The financing of this program still bothers me. It was announced, unless I'm completely wrong, that you would find the funds for this program whether or not the Legislature authorized any money. The Governor then presented his budget, and he presented his budget without any money for this program in that budget.

DR. GROSS: The budget was announced a month or more before we came up with this program.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: But there have been supplements

to it. The bill was just signed two or three days ago.

Is the Governor in support of this program?

DR. GROSS: I just talked to the Governor once on the phone. He was uninformed and I send down the materials to him.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: But he couldn't be too uninformed if he reads the papers.

DR. GROSS: I'm telling you what the Governor said to me on the phone.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: In other words, you don't know whether or not the Governor is in support of this program or not?

DR. GROSS: He asked for the materials to study. He did not express an opinion.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: On another subject: There was a meeting at Newark Rutgers which I talked to you briefly about on the phone, the so-called Newark high school liberation movement. Now I don't want to rehash old subjects except it did occur, it was in my mind akin to somebody shouting "Fire" in a crowded theatre to hold that meeting at that time on State property. All I would like if I could, could I have an assurance from you, or will you give us an assurance that you will do your best to see that this kind of situation does not occur again and that this kind of meeting does not occur -

DR. GROSS: I will try to keep much closer to the situation.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: And, finally, the newspapers on Sunday, or one newspaper certainly was full of the so-called

Rutgers Master Plan. I assume it exists. I haven't seen anything of it but I assume there is a Rutgers Master Plan?

DR. GROSS: Well, it is part of this business of developing a State Plan. We were asked by the Chancellor's Office to come up with our ideas about a Master Plan so far as the university was concerned. I might say that one of the things that has bothered us for years is that there has not been a State Master Plan. It has made it very hard for us to plan our own future - how many students should we take, and that type of thing? - without a Master Plan and, therefore, we are tremendously pleased that this is going forward now. We were all asked to submit what we had as our plan, which are more or less the on-going plans, the thing that determines our decisions from day to day. This thing has been put together and is called "Interim Master Plan," and what it really does is compile an account of the programs of the various colleges as prepared by the Dean so the faculties in those colleges can tell you what is going on and where it seems to be moving. It also tells you certain things that have come to us as requests that we should undertake, without any decision at this point as to whether we should or not; in other words, it looks into the very short range future.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: It bothers me a little bit, Dr. Gross, that we, for instance, who serve on the Education Committee read about something like this in the newspapers. Is it possible for us to get a copy when there is something like a Master Plan?

DR. GROSS: I will see that you all get copies. I'm sorry that you didn't.

SENATOR HIERING: Dr. Gross, just getting back for a minute to this question of disorders. I understand that there are guidelines not only at Rutgers but in the other colleges at the present time. Now, in these guidelines at Rutgers, has any notification been given to students that for engaging in the illegal taking of a facility they would be subject to expulsion or suspension?

DR. GROSS: It is indicated that this is a matter that is treated with deepest seriousness, or words to that effect - which means just that. But we did not want to spell out penalties. Now maybe we are wrong in that case. After all, when a person takes over a building, he doesn't wonder whether or not it's illegal. He knows perfectly well it is illegal and he is standing right up and defying you on that score. So then you figure your next move from that point.

SENATOR HIERING: Well, this concerns me. I agree with you that we can use persuasion and not force, in an attempt to keep down the fire, etc., and that perhaps it should be considered, but what bothers me somewhat is if you negotiate, for instance, under your present policy with student groups and they are not satisfied, if at that particular point they illegally take one of your facilities, it seems to me to further negotiate at that point, and particularly if you intend to make any concession in order to knock off the possession of the building, you may in the long run be encouraging them to take this form of action in order to get what they want and still not face expulsion or suspension. That's why I'm asking

you, do you think that your students should be specifically informed that if they engage in illegal activities, so far as the taking of facilities is concerned, they would be subject to expulsion or suspension.

DR. GROSS: I think they fully expect that too. I'm not talking particularly about our case but similar cases, but the problem is, how many road-blocks do you throw out? If you do this, then the very first thing, as you will see from other campuses everywhere, is that they all demand as a condition of their coming out amnesty. You've got to grant amnesty before you grant a penalty, as a matter of fact. You have seen this repeatedly happen on other campuses. In a sense it's a block to further rational discussions because what they are saying is, "Go on, get the police and have them get us out of here." I really, honestly and truly and as sincerely as I can express it, believe that that is perilously close to ruining the university along with the constitutional rights of the other kids there, and that you really wreck things the minute you've done that.

SENATOR HIERING: As I understand it, then you would be against any such policy of saying to the student, "If you engage in rioting, if you engage in the taking of our facility, you will be subject to expulsion and suspension."

DR. GROSS: I don't think I want to spell it out quite that clearly, but it obviously implies that.

SENATOR HIERING: Any further questions?

DR. GROSS: I might say that those are the only penalties we have, and we can't put people in jail or anything else. The only penalties we have, the only thing we would consider when

we call them up would be whether that would be the appropriate penalty.

SENATOR HIERING: I don't think that's the only penalty you have. I think you have the right of making charges of the violation of law against your own students.

DR. GROSS: I meant in accordance with our own academic procedures.

SENATOR DUMONT: Doctor, did you say in respect to the financing of this new program, or did any representative to your knowledge of the Board of Governors say at one point that if the Legislature did not provide the money you would get it elsewhere?

DR. GROSS: In the resolution it said we were going to try to get this money and our first source was the Legislature, or we would have to try other sources. Now, clearly, Senator, I have to say this. This is why it's in there, because I can't commit the Legislature. If we are going to go forward with the program, we are going to try to get it from what we think is the appropriate source, but if we cannot get it from there we will try elsewhere. We can try to share the burden.

SENATOR DUMONT: Have you exhausted all the other sources before coming to the Legislature, or are you coming to the Legislature first before even attempting any other sources?

DR. GROSS: Because of the timing, in order to get going, we have gone to the Trustees who have given us \$500,000. Now we have been to the foundations, we've got some assistance from the foundations for separate parts of an over-all program but not for this main basic program. The Carnegie Foundation

recently gave us two hundred for part of the program in curriculum in community affairs at Livingston College; the Ford Foundation, I believe, is going to include us in a program which they are interested in which we will work out jointly with Princeton and with Lincoln University, and there is assistance coming from the foundations but not for the basic part of the program. They won't pick that kind of thing up apparently.

SENATOR DUMONT: Is it true that the American Legion is shifting its BOYS' STATE from the Rutgers Campus in New Brunswick to Rider College this year?

DR. GROSS: They have done so already, yes. They determined this a year ago.

SENATOR DUMONT: Is there any reason that you know of why they did not continue with Rutgers?

DR. GROSS: One of the difficulties on our campus has been that in order to get the students across the various roads and what not, they march them in quasi-military style and this provokes certain taunting, I would say, from some of the pacifist students.

SENATOR SUMONT: You mean, on the part of members of the student body?

DR. GROSS: Yes. And the American Legion decided they didn't want that. I believe that's the reason. On the other hand, I have from them on that occasion a letter thanking us for all the tremendous cooperation we have given them over the years.

SENATOR DUMONT: Well, actually they have been at Rutgers

for a number of years.

DR. GROSS: Yes, since about 1946.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: As a suggestion through the chair, it seems to me that the question of responsibility so far as approach and procedure are concerned when there are student disruptions on our campuses which have arisen and come up for discussion up to now, I think we should enter as part of our investigation, probe or study that we determine what responsibility does exist on the part of the universities and make it clear as part of the record what our feeling is in relationship to presidents of universities, faculty and students, and all parties concerned when laws have been broken on our campuses. That is my suggestion through the chair.

MR. HIERING: Well, we are making an investigation under Assembly Concurrent Resolution No. 86. It is rather broad in scope and I think that any determination that our Joint Committees would make would be after we have looked into the various matters and have exhausted all of our sources of information.

Are there any further questions of Dr. Gross?

ASSEMBLYMAN CURCIO: Dr. Gross, has anyone participating in the seizures either in Camden or in Newark been penalized by way of suspension, expulsion, or in any other way whatsoever?

DR. GROSS: No, sir. They have been given warning through their organization and through their members, where there was an organization, that any repetition would be very serious.

ASSEMBLYMAN CURCIO: They have all been granted amnesty, I gather?

DR. GROSS: Well, there was no penalty assigned and there was no amnesty.

SENATOR HIERING: Anything further?

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: Dr. Gross, I think this has been a very fruitful opportunity for you as President of Rutgers and the panel. I think this meeting has been long delayed and I would like to say at this point, if I can, or ask the question that possibly if situations such as these do come about in the future and you should not personalize it or interject your own feeling.- if the law is broken, what exactly would you do?

SENATOR HIERING: Assemblyman Caputo -

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: I asked a question.

DR. GROSS: I don't know, sir. I would try to resolve it as rapidly as possible.

SENATOR HIERING: Any further questions? If not, thank you, Dr. Gross.

Before adjourning for lunch or recessing for lunch we have had one special request that a gentleman be heard. Will Mr. Hendricks please come forward?

Mr. Hendricks, will you first give us your full name and address, please.

T H O M A S A . H E N D R I C K S: My name is Thomas Allen Hendricks of 11 Stella Drive, Somerville, New Jersey.

SENATOR HIERING: You may proceed.

MR. HENDRICKS:

Mr. Chairman, Members of this Committee:

I first would like to thank you for the opportunity to speak here on the issues being explored.

From the outset, I would like to emphasize that I come here with no chip on my shoulder, nor hoping to highlight a personal grievance. Instead, I hope to draw upon a personal experience in order to illustrate issues which may well contribute to public grievance, issues of immeasurable importance to the future of Higher Education in New Jersey--and the welfare of its citizens.

Regarding personal experience, I've been a legal resident of Somerville, N.J. for over seven years. In September, 1962, I enrolled at Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa. as a pre-law student, majoring in political science. By June, 1964, I had completed four semesters there, during which time my academic record there was at best undistinguished--a low "C" average. Faced with the prospect of a similarly dismal fifth semester, I withdrew from school the following Fall, and enlisted in the Army. I did so, following a period of self-examination, leading to the conclusion that I then lacked the maturity and genuine sense of direction necessary to benefit from the type of curriculum in which I was enrolled. I felt then, as I feel now, that the Army was a place to mature, to learn, and to grow up.

HENDRICKS, Thomas A.

As most young men, I entered the Army as a buck-private. After a period of training as a combat infantryman, I was shipped to Viet Nam in September, 1965. During my year of duty on the front lines, I held positions such as radio operator, team leader, and squad leader. I earned the purple heart, thanks to enemy gun fire, and, coincidentally contracted malaria. During my many hours on outpost duty in the field, and on over 75 ambush patrols, I had the opportunity to ponder over my post-combat future, if indeed there was to be one. I decided there that, should I return, I would resume my undergraduate work and then go on to law school.

I was one of the fortunate ones who returned from Viet Nam relatively intact. I was re-assigned to Fort Polk (in La.) where, subsequent to a number of promotions, I served in capacities such as drill serseant and machine gun instructor. Despite an average workday of 14 hours, I enrolled in off-duty night courses at McNeese State College, where I earned six credits toward my college degree.

I was released from active duty three months early in order that I might re-enroll at Dickinson College in time to attend the Fall, 1967 semester. During the 1967-1968 academic year, my grades were considerably higher than those of the past ("C+/B-" average). During the Summer of 1968, I attended the University of Southern California, where I earned eight more credits toward my degree and recorded a straight "A" average.

HENDRICKS, Thomas A.

It was anticipated I would receive my B.A. degree, upon the completion of the Fall, 1968 semester at Dickinson. However, on 11/3/68, I suffered a fall, sustaining injuries resulting in paraplegia. Subsequently, it was found that I had been experiencing a recurrence of malaria, with probable vertigo, at the time of the fall. At any rate, I've been hospitalized since that fall. At this very moment, in fact, I am appearing while on a one-day pass from the VA Hospital, East Orange, where, hopefully, physical rehabilitation will enable me to attend law school this Fall.

Hospitalization, however, by no means terminated efforts to attain my academic goals. In view of the structure of my courses, which were of a seminar, outside reading and research nature, arrangements were made for me to have an opportunity to complete requirements for my degree in time for graduation this June. In 1/69, Dean Thomas Carver of Dickinson College began serving as liason between myself and my instructors, communicating various assignments, tests, etc.

During most of this period, I was bedridden, confined to a horizontal position, in accordance with medical prescriptions designed to foster spontaneous fusion of fractured vertebrae and eliminate the necessity for further operations. With the use of prismatic glasses and other devices, I was able to complete two rather formidable seminar term papers, perform well during administration of two comprehensive final exams, as well as take the Law School Admission Test (LSAT), administered at bedside by

HENDRICKS, Thomas A.

Educational Testing Service on 2/8/69/ Despite the somewhat unusual physical circumstances during test administration, my LSAT performance resulted in scores exceeding those of from 68% to 79% of other law school applicants in the various LSAT categories. Finally, by 5/9/69, I had completed all requirements for my B.A. degree, earning grades of no less than "B" for all courses of my final undergraduate semester.

It should be noted that, while Dickinson College was charitable in affording me the opportunity to complete my degree requirements, such charity justifiably was not extended with respect to dilution of degree requirements nor with respect to evaluation of work deemed acceptable. Assemblyman Scancarella can readily attest to this, for it was he who so kindly helped provide raw material concerning water pollution, which was incorporated into a rather lengthy dissertation (nearly 100 pages) on contemporary economic and political problems.

While hospitalized, I also applied for admission to a number of law schools, only one of which was in New Jersey: Rutgers Law School, Newark. The reason for this concerned advice, that I received to the effect that the latter institution was the only law school in New Jersey fully architecturally equipped to accommodate students confined to wheel chairs, subsequent investigation

HENDRICKS, Thomas A.

found to be totally incorrect.

Following helpful encouragement (by VA personnel) to further pursue my academic goals despite the condition of my body, on 3/27/69 I experienced my first encounter with an academic official unknown to me prior to my injury. This encounter was at the Newark Rutgers Law School, where I was "interviewed" by John G. Graham, Assistant Dean and (de facto) Director of Admissions for that institution. The duration of that interview was something less than fifteen minutes and of a nature unlike anything I had ever experienced as a student or a potential student.

After presenting a few unofficial academic documents in my possession at the time (e.g., Summer School grades), I asked Dean Graham to what extent the Law School was architecturally equipped to accommodate students confined to wheel chairs. At this point, Mr. Graham responded with what I felt were seemingly irrelevant statements regarding certain federal requirements that all buildings funded by federal sources must be built to accommodate the physically handicapped. While unable to recall his precise comments, I believe the words he used to describe these regulations were "silly" and/or "a nuisance." Although unable to precisely cite his statement, the attitude he conveyed was one of apparent resentment for the above regulations, indifference to me, and, I presume, to the problems that a disability such as mine might represent.

Mr. Graham concluded the interview rather abruptly by suggesting that I apply to Seton Hall or Rutgers School of Law at Camden. Thus, while absolute rejection was not forthcoming at that time, its imminence was implied.

Further indication of Dean Graham's rather brusque and indifferent attitude was reflected by his decision to completely ignore the presence of a VA representative, described to Dean Graham as having accompanied me to Newark, in part for the purpose of providing potentially relevant regarding my physical and academic status.

On 3/31/69, I wrote to Mr. Anthony Volpe, Director of Veterans Services for New Jersey, relating to him facts regarding my encounter with Mr. Graham and asking him for recommendations, etc. concerning law schools equipped to accommodate physically handicapped veterans.

Mr. Volpe subsequently wrote to Willard Heckel, Dean of Rutgers University Law School-Newark and past president of the Newark V.C.C., inquiring as to the nature of my interview at Rutgers-Newark. In a memorandum from Dean Graham to Dean Heckel relayed to Mr. Volpe, Dean Graham commented on the aforementioned interview. Several statements in this memorandum made by Dean Graham concerning my interview may provide some insight. I should say here that, should there be any doubts as to my veracity, due to the incredulous nature of Mr. Graham's memo, I have it with me available for your examination upon request.

HENDRICKS, Thomas A.

". . . Mr. Hendricks' first remark was that the interview was less than fifteen minutes. I think that is the case. I think it is also true that fifteen minutes is approximately the time I spend with all potential applicants and there was nothing different about his interview." I find it hard to believe that Dean Graham could say that there was nothing different about my interview, unless he had failed to notice my wheel chair.

". . . I also remember having discussed the fact that, because the Law School was built with federal funds, the regulations require that the buildings have elevators in order to accommodate physically-handicapped veterans. I do not recall having described these regulations as being 'silly' or being a 'nuisance'." Selective recall is a legally sound device, particularly when blanket denial is not possible.

". . . I am particularly resentful of Mr. Hendricks' last sentence. About the fact that he didn't like my attitude, I couldn't care less." Mr. Graham's statement that he couldn't care less is the same attitude he conveyed to me in my interview. Yet, in his statement to Mr. Volpe, Graham claimed that he didn't know what I was talking about when I referred to his underlying attitude of indifference.

". . . It is true that I suggested to him that he apply elsewhere.

HENDRICKS, Thomas A.

namely to Seton Hall and Camden." Seton Hall and Rutgers-Camden are by their own admission not fully architecturally accessible to wheel chair students. Why then foster further frustration by making such recommendations?

". . . I did this because it was clear to me from his file and his interview that he would be rejected. This was simply based on a fact that he had a mediocre record." I was interviewed by Dean Graham on March 27, 1969. Records will show that, as of that date, Graham had not received any official transcripts, scores, etc. Yet, based on my "record" and a less than fifteen minutes interview, Dean Graham states that it was clear to him that I would be rejected.

Subsequently, Dean Carver of Dickinson sent Graham my transcript together with a letter of recommendation, dated April 8, in which he asks that Dean Graham ". . . notice that there are three incompletes on his record. This is a result of Tom completing his work this semester while hospitalized and the prognosis of these incompletes turning into better than average grades is quite high." Yet, I have been advised that Dean Graham has most recently cited those no longer existing incompletes as part of his current defense.

". . . Mr. Hendricks' perception of the Law School's attitude (and perhaps, also of my own) are unfortunately being severely colored by his present mental attitude." Some might call this projection. Were it not for my reluctance to engage in recriminations, I would

HENDRICKS, Thomas A.

comment on Mr. Graham's interlude into the field of armchair psychology. Since hospitalized, I have undergone thorough psychological testing as required by the Veterans Administration and the N.J. State Rehabilitation Commission for purposes of funding continuance of my higher education. I would be most willing to have the results of my psychological tests published if Mr. Graham would be willing to undergo the same series of tests and have them published also. I might even be willing to pay for the costs involved in the interest of the State of New Jersey.

Mr. Volpe was apprised of my official rejection from Rutgers-Newark on April 28, 1969, whereupon he again contacted Dean Graham and asked if there was no way that this rejection notice might be reconsidered. I would like to publicly thank Mr. Volpe for his efforts on my behalf. That there was no apparent reconsideration may be due to the limitations of Mr. Volpe's office, which in my case rendered him dependent upon the offices of the Chancellor of Higher Education.

I stated earlier that I was not here to air a personal grievance nor am I here to seek further consideration of my case. I am fortunate in that I have been accepted by a number of out-of-state law schools whose competitive standards, according to Lovejoy's Guide to American Law Schools, are equal to, if not exceeding those of, Newark Rutgers. I am sorry, however, that I am forced to leave

New Jersey, which is my home and where I hope to practice law upon completion of my studies. I am also sorry for the state of New Jersey which may well lose some thousands of dollars financing my education out of state. But lastly, I feel sorry for those people who might follow me. The war in Viet Nam is still going on, and I assure the people of New Jersey that the handicapped or disabled veteran will not continue to be a rarity on college campuses much longer. I have been fortunate in having the aid and assistance of Assemblyman Scancarella, Director Volpe, the New Jersey State Rehabilitation Commission, and the Veterans Administration in helping me to overcome my disability. I feel that I shall soon become a taxpayer and not a tax burden. I have been fortunate, but what of those who will follow me, those who may not be equally fortunate?

I ask this committee to consider that, as long as we are reviewing admissions policies on the basis of economic and cultural disadvantage, race, and academic credentials, it might also be propitious to evaluate admissions policies on the basis of other factors such as regional balance and physical handicaps such as my own.

I also ask that members of this committee recommend to the Assembly as a whole the passage of Senate Bills 55 and 56. These bills which concern architectural barriers to the physically handicapped have been passed in the Senate but have not yet come up for a

vote in the Assembly. Architectural barriers may well be the greatest obstacle faced by wheel-chair bound individuals on their road to rehabilitation. No one has yet invented a wheel chair that can climb stairs.

I thank this committee for their kind attention,

SENATOR HIERING: Are there any questions by members of the Committee?

SENATOR DUMONT: Mr. Hendricks, is your disability classified as service connected?

MR. HENDRICKS: Not at present. They are still working on it. My case is still being investigated by the Veterans Administration,

SENATOR DUMONT: Did you mention in there where you had been accepted at Law School?

MR. HENDRICKS: No, I didn't, but I have letters of acceptance with me. I have been accepted at Boston College Law School, University of Indiana, University of Florida, and University of Arizona. I also have an application in the University of Miami which I still haven't heard from. So far, I have had only one rejection.

SENATOR DUMONT: Did you make any application at Seton Hall in fact?

MR. HENDRICKS: No, I did not. They are by their own admission not able to -

SENATOR DUMONT: They are not able to take care of your disability. Thank you.

SENATOR HIERING: If it is agreeable to members of the Committee, I would ask Mr. Hendricks leave a copy of his

statement with us, and I would like to refer it to Dr. Mason Gross and ask him to look into the matter and give the Committee a report. Is that satisfactory to the Committee? [Agreed] All right. We will ask Dr. Gross to report back as soon as possible in connection with your making a decision as to where you might attend law school. So if you will leave a copy of your report with us, we will look into it.

Thank you, sir.

MR. HENDRICKS: Thank you very much.

SENATOR HIERING: We will now recess until 2:15 o'clock.

[R E C E S S]

AFTERNOON SESSION

SENATOR HIERING: I would like to call the hearing to order. We would appreciate it if you would all take your seats. We will call Mr. Anthony J. Volpe.

A N T H O N Y J. V O L P E: Ladies and gentlemen, I am Anthony J. Volpe, State Director of the Division of Veterans Services. You have had the opportunity to hear the testimony of Mr. Thomas Hendricks, a disabled Vietnam Veteran, whom this Division represents. Mr. Hendricks served in Vietnam, was wounded in action, and subsequently through injury became a paraplegic.

Permit me to say briefly that this young veteran has demonstrated to school authorities, to professional authorities, to the Veterans Administration, and to the State Division of Veterans Services that he has a cogent and burning desire to confront his disablement, to upgrade his educational level with the ultimate goal of becoming a professional person.

I will not detail completely my experience with Rutgers School of Law concerning this veteran except to say that in my cogent and studied opinion a more considerate attitude could have been taken by the Assistant Dean at the School of Law of Rutgers to admit this qualified and deserving veteran.

I sincerely believe that it is a tragedy upon our State when a New Jersey citizen, and in particular a disabled veteran, meets the qualifications of such outstanding universities as Boston University and yet, according to Rutgers, does not meet at least in a high academic sense the admission requirements to Rutgers. Conversely there are attempts by

both our State Government and our Federal Government to reconsider, or at least make more accessible, admission standards for the disadvantaged or under-educated citizens. I might add here that the case of Mr. Hendricks is not entirely unique when we consider the fact that some 85 per cent of New Jersey's war orphan students find it necessary with state aid moneys to go outside of New Jersey for their academic learning. Furthermore, New Jersey ranks fifth in the big 10 States of our nation suffering the largest number of Vietnam casualties and killed, wounded, and disabled. In addition, each and every month in New Jersey 2800 New Jersey citizens are being discharged or relieved back into civilian life, and among them, ladies and gentlemen, are many seriously disabled veterans.

It seems reasonable for me to request this Committee to consider seriously some formula whereby individuals like Mr. Hendricks, as well as our New Jersey war orphans, may have some extra or preferential consideration by the New Jersey state colleges and universities for admission so that we may retain these young people and retain their talents and profit from the sacrifices of their mothers and fathers who are tax-paying citizens.

I do not ask nor recommend that the standards of our schools be lowered unless they are lowered for other individuals, but I do respectfully suggest that the need for Mr. Hendricks not to leave New Jersey but to remain here in spite of the fact that he has been admitted by an outstanding university at Boston, Massachusetts. I should think that Rutgers University should

reconsider this veteran, this citizen's request for admission in a New Jersey State-endowed school.

In conclusion, may I add that the one million ten thousand veterans of New Jersey and the additional sixty thousand new veterans every year, and more specifically our seriously disabled veterans and war orphans should receive the attention I feel they deserve. Our government is not unkind, our government is one of the most considerate in the United States, but I do believe that State government ought to look hard and long and restudy the needs of New Jersey's disabled veterans and New Jersey's war orphans. If this is done, gentlemen, I feel that men like Mr. Hendricks and our war orphans need not go to the tune of 85 per cent to schools outside of our State for their academic learning. I feel that the sacrifices, the money spent, and the heartaches of motherhood and fatherhood in raising these New Jersey citizens would be well worth our giving them some preferential treatment in our New Jersey State Schools and Universities.

I wish to thank this Committee, Mr. Hendricks, and Mrs. Hendricks, his mother, for the opportunity of representing such a fine young combat-experienced veteran.

Thank you.

SENATOR DUMONT: Mr. Volpe, have you had other experiences with the State University in respect to veterans, not necessarily back from Vietnam, but it could be some of those or other veteran cases you have, where you have had the same type experience that Mr. Hendricks related?

MR. VOLPE: We seem to have a problem with the university,

Senator, by a working program that we have with the U. S. Veterans Administration Hospital at East Orange, New Jersey, where they are engaged in the rehabilitation, the physical and psychological rehabilitation of these seriously-disabled veterans. A very important part of that rehabilitation is an educational attainment or endeavor, and we have had another occasion with Rutgers University with a paraplegic veteran. But our veterans usually apply to the schools as individuals and we, in our capacity, make available all the necessary Veterans Administration files and powers of attorney and applications and only when they meet difficulty does that case come back to us, but usually by that time, Senator, it is too late for admission purposes.

SENATOR DUMONT: Well, have you had other cases come back aside from Mr. Hendricks' case?

MR. VOLPE: Yes, we have had three cases in all this year.

SENATOR DUMONT: Involving the Law School or different parts of Rutgers?

MR. VOLPE: Different parts. This is the second Law School situation. Dr. Mayer, who is the Chief Psychologist of the Veterans Administration Hospital of East Orange has referred another case to me, but at this point it is a little too late to do anything about it because the admission okays have been granted to students for this fall's enrollment, so the student has selected another school outside New Jersey.

SENATOR DUMONT: That was the Law School case also?

MR. VOLPE: Yes.

SENATOR DUMONT: Were there any other schools of Rutgers involved, any other schools of the University involved, in the other cases?

MR. VOLPE: Well, my only so-called confrontation with Rutgers, Senator, has been the same as it has been with all schools in New Jersey. I have long felt that some preferential consideration ought to have been granted and, of course, they don't want to listen to that kind of talk at all.

SENATOR DUMONT: Well, you say "all other schools," - are you talking about publicly-supported schools or privately-endowed universities?

MR. VOLPE: I am talking about publicly-supported schools.

SENATOR DUMONT: You haven't any problems with any of the privately-endowed colleges?

MR. VOLPE: No, sir. In fact, Monmouth College, which is in the center of the hiring area, is very cooperative; in fact, they have a special veterans committee. The Mercer County Community College has a special veterans committee to iron out these problems before they become acute or chronic problems.

SENATOR DUMONT: Is there any such committee in any of the State-supported colleges or universities?

MR. VOLPE: Not to my knowledge; they haven't been brought to my attention.

SENATOR DUMONT: Have you tried to organize any or help them?

MR. VOLPE: We have not tried to organize any because

our jurisdiction does not go into that area, Senator.

SENATOR DUMONT: All right, thank you.

SENATOR HEIRING: Anything further? Thank you, Mr. Volpe.

Now, next, if there are any members of the Board of Governors of Rutgers present who wish to be heard, we will be glad to hear from them. If not, we will next call Mr. Marvin W. Greenberg.

M A R V I N W. G R E E N B E R G: I have no formal statement, gentlemen, but perhaps it would be valuable to recall for those of you who already know and for those of you who may not know, some facts about Rutgers University, the State University of New Jersey, in Newark. I am Assistant Vice President of Rutgers in Newark. I think it might be proper for the situation to be placed in perspective as to the place of Rutgers in Newark in the total university. There are some 4,228 college credit day students, about 7778 evening college credit students; in sum, we have 27.6 per cent of the University's total college credit enrollment at Rutgers in Newark in the day and evening programs at the University there. In all, we serve about 12,000 students during the academic year and this includes non-credit extension division and continuing legal education courses as well.

Chancellor Dungan and President Gross mentioned the co-operative efforts of the public institutions of higher education in Newark, and I would just like to speak briefly to that point again for your information.

For more than a year now, the New Jersey College of Medicine and Dentistry, Rutgers University in Newark, Newark College of Engineering, and Essex County College have had an informal arrangement whereby a sub-group meets monthly and the Presidents or heads of the institutions meet periodically to work on immediate and long-range problems. There are four task forces in this cooperative group, one on nursing and some of the results of that were described to you by Chancellor Dungan earlier today; a committee to increase the articulation between a two-year college, Essex County College, and a four-year institution, and that's at work; a committee on the physical and curricular planning, and one on the recruitment of disadvantaged students.

In addition, we have had a number of other individual meetings to bring faculty members of the various institutions together and we are talking about a wide range of situations from non-duplication of library collections where we are in close proximity, to cooperative efforts in Ph.D. work in biochemistry, and to the teaching by Rutgers of certain subjects not now given by the Newark College of Engineering, specifically biology, which is of interest to that college for bio-medical engineering. We are right across the street, and we offer that subject to them.

Our students have ready cross-registration with the Newark College of Engineering and we are in the process of working out similar arrangements with the other colleges to avoid duplication.

I might say on a subject which has not been mentioned except peripherally that we at Rutgers in Newark, as all

public institutions of higher education, are greatly concerned about the availability of capital funds. I might point out to those of you who hasn't visited our campus and don't know that prior to the bond issue appropriation of 1959, 1964, and the most recent one in 1968, Rutgers in Newark had a substantial number of students in what was physically a slum. As a result of the activities of the Governor and the Legislature, members of both parties, we have begun to develop a new campus, but unfortunately as is true with all building, it is not coming rapidly enough, and we find ourselves in some instances already, having entered new facilities in 1967, in a crowded position.

Now I recognize that everyone who appears before legislators has a case and frequently a legitimate case for more funds, and I realize as a citizen and as a taxpayer that public funds are not inexhaustible. I know too that Rutgers, as other State agencies, has over the past several years submitted annually a six-year capital plan to the Executive Branch for consideration by the Legislature for the funding of buildings. I realize too that funds are not always available when requested, and so at times the six-year plan is a dream but it is not a dream to those of us who have to provide places for students. That's the business we're in and that's our major concern.

I realize that the State has been most generous this past year with substantial bond issues. I know that each of you gentlemen know full well the total needs and I would urge, if possible, that consideration be given to planning between bond issues, as in the past it has been possible to do so, in order that these colleges, both Rutgers and the other

public institutions, may grow not in gasps but in a continuous way. I would not ask you to appropriate moneys that could not be spent quickly; obviously you wouldn't want to do this. We at Rutgers in Newark are faced now with gaps in our physical facility which of course must reflect upon the kinds of academic programs and the quantity of people that we can serve.

I would suggest that you consider some method of appropriation, if possible annually, or as often as you can, in between bond issues so that the progress can be on a continuous basis.

Gentlemen, I had not come with a prepared statement. This is, so to speak, off the cuff. I am ready to answer any questions that you may have.

SENATOR HEIRING: Are there any questions, gentlemen?

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: I have one question. Do you think there is any merit to the proposal that has been mentioned here today for a separate campus at Newark, or a separate university rather?

MR. GREENBERG: Assemblyman Kean, it is very difficult to answer a question of that nature. I think it is fair to say that most of us, the students, faculty, and administration of Rutgers in Newark feel that we would like to remain within the Rutgers system. However, we do feel that there would be an advantage to us and perhaps to other units of the University into some more local option in terms of certain operating procedures, certain budget requests, and things of this nature. As you know, and it's been reported today, these things are

under study not only by the members of the Board of Trustees, Board of Governors, but also by the individual faculties, and it is my thought that as a result of this there would be changes in the procedure which could provide at a lower level, at a local level, certain things which are not now possible. Obviously we have grown, and any institution has to evaluate itself, and it's my hope that there will be an evaluation with the resulting procedures which provide more opportunity for local option, local developments, and things of that nature.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: In other words, what you are saying is that we should wait and see what the committees do and see what they recommend and if what they recommend is what you want.

MR. GREENBERG: Precisely. It's difficult to say, without having specifics, how best the University should be governed. Again, and not trying to be facetious, while the structure is important to those of us who operate on a day-to-day basis, you've known it and have known it very well, what really happens in the allocation of funds and when there are not inexhaustible sums of money, it's there the crunch comes, so to speak. Were there sufficient funds for all of the programs needed in the State, ours as well, the system, the organization, would not be as much of a problem.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: Well, there will never be.

MR. GREENBERG: Obviously, definitely.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: I have never known a university that didn't need more funds, but the point is you feel that, with the committees that are working on it now, or you hope

that structually the problems that the Newark campus has in relationship to the rest of the University will be straightened out and there will not be a feeling of inferiority which I have detected on the part of Newark at the present time.

MR. GREENBERG: It is my hope that this will come about.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: In what length of time?

MR. GREENBERG: As soon as possible, hopefully.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: The committee should have a reporting date. Is that right? Is there any kind of a time limit within which you think this problem may be brought to a head?

MR. GREENBERG: I would hope certainly no later than the end of the coming academic year; that is, about this time next year, or shortly before this time,- the study should have been concluded, I hope, and there would be some results which could be made available to the Legislature.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: As I read from the agenda, you are Assistant Vice President of Rutgers in Newark. I would like to ask you, as part of that administration, how you feel about the programs that have developed since the disturbances at Newark and how well was it handled, in your opinion as administrator, at the Newark campus?

MR. GREENBERG: Assemblyman Caputo, I can only say in all candid honesty, we did the best we could to continue the operation of the University and to resolve what were very sore and pressing problems. I think the new program which the Board of Governors has enunciated in the urban university program offers an opportunity to black and white disadvantaged students in our city of Newark which they previously did not

have. It's a primary program and all of us concerned with it are going to work very hard to see that it succeeds. It represents a real jump forward, a jump far beyond what was requested by the students, and I think, if it works, it will be history-making and will be looked upon in other States as an innovation well worth emulating.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: In retrospect, do you feel that anything could have been done differently so far as the relationship between the administration and the advice of the administration and relationship to the students at that time?

MR. GREENBERG: We did have numerous meetings with the students prior to the take-over of the building. If we were to do it again, it is my view we should have had more meetings; we should have worked harder to resolve the problem without resort to the taking over of the building.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: Do you feel that that was the only recourse the students had, at that time to take over a building; in other words, to use whatever forceful means that they could to resolve their problems? Was there any other way in which they could have handled this?

MR. GREENBERG: The University had continuous negotiations with the students and it was our hope that through the process of discussion and negotiation it could have been resolved. I can't place myself in the position of the students. It is quite possible that the students felt they had no other recourse than to dramatize the situation by taking over a building. However, channels were open; they had been for many months previously. I think - and here I am conjecturing -

the students felt that they were not moving, that the progress was not moving sufficiently rapidly and that they had to dramatize the situation to bring about certain changes which they felt had to be brought about.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: In speaking of this, doesn't it seem then, and the students realizing that this method does achieve the end, so far as Rutgers University is concerned, this may seem too successful a method for projection, and I hope that the situation doesn't arise again. But it seems to me that there is a tremendous willingness now because of that situation to deal with student demands which did not exist before. What I object to is possibly not a stopping and re-evaluating what has happened, but it seems to me almost a total collapse as far as Rutgers University and the demands of students, regardless of how they achieve them. I think there must be some kind of emphasis on this method of achieving demands without using the proper methods to achieve their goals.

MR. GREENBERG: We have had many situations in which students have come to the University and made requests for a change. Only a dead society doesn't change. We have resolved these many requests over the years and in recent years without dramatic incident last February, and we have requests of the University for a change since that time and they have been resolved through a process of discussion and deliberation.

Let me say also that we wouldn't be very good people if we didn't learn something since last February. And while we have had machinery previously, we have much more machinery

and we have devoted a great deal of time even more than previously to meet with students and try to resolve the situation so that students would not feel, whether justified or not justified, that they had to resort to a dramatic incident to achieve their objective.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: Maybe you were intimately involved because of the mere geography of the situation - possibly we can't have it now but at some later date - could we have from you or from Mr. Talbott, the Vice President of Rutgers, a blow-by-blow account of what exactly did happen at Rutgers University so that I, and the members of this Committee can examine what did take place and be able to evaluate and isolate it from any other particular development. I was wondering if we could have that from you or from Mr. Talbott.

MR. GREENBERG: We will be happy to cooperate and give it to you in any form you wish, sir, either individually or to the whole committee at large at any time you wish.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: Is there any possibility there will be more applicants or more recruitments than you have space for this coming academic year?

MR. GREENBERG: Assemblyman Ewing, because of the date on which this program is getting underway and because of the fact that many youngsters make their plans in advance, it is likely that our estimates will either be on the nose or perhaps a little low. I would like to defer to Mr. John Martin, who has been developing this, for a more specific answer. But when working with Mr. Martin we talked with officials of the

Newark Board of Education - I think you are talking about the Urban University program -

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: Yes.

MR. GREENBERG: - we worked closely with them and they with the guidance counsellors and people in the individual high schools in the City of Newark to construct the estimates. We, therefore, feel that they are reasonable estimates and, in fact, because of the lateness in which the program is getting underway, we should be within what our expectations are.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: Won't you be developing new students that hadn't even thought of going to college?

MR. GREENBERG: I think we will but I think -

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: As far as the date date, I would think more would be coming forward.

MR. GREENBERG: That's true, but not everyone wishes to go to Rutgers. You may know, sir, that the City of Newark is the place where private and other public colleges from other States come to recruit in numbers because they are trying to increase the diversity of their colleges. Not everyone chooses to go to college in his own home town; he will instead choose to go out of the city or out of the State and, therefore, not every youngster who would be eligible for the program will choose Rutgers in Newark as the place to attend.

ASSEMBLYMAN CURCIO: Mr. Greenberg, you just said that not everyone is eligible for the program or would choose to go to Newark and may choose to go out of State. Just who is going to be eligible for this program?

MR. GREENBERG: Well, Assembly Curcio, this would be

students who are academically and educationally disadvantaged under the definitions which President Gross gave to you earlier today, who are residents of Newark, who have received a diploma from a Newark public or private high school, and a New Brunswick one and a Camden one.

ASSEMBLYMAN CURCIO: What courses are going to be offered to these students?

MR. GREENBERG: Well, I can give it to you in general but since you are to hear from Mr. Martin about the program subsequently, I would like to defer to him as to that specific question. He can be more specific than I would be.

SENATOR DUMONT: The question was asked Dr. Gross this morning about the 10 or 12 people in the Admissions Office on the Newark campus. He indicated what has happened with Mr. Schwab and Mr. Miller. What about the rest of them who tendered their resignations?

MR. GREENBERG: The University repeatedly and more than once offered to the clerical staff of the Admissions Office opportunity to return as recently as, I believe, three weeks ago again, and all of the ladies involved chose not to return.

SENATOR DUMONT: Does that mean that everybody in the Admissions Office is no longer there?

MR. GREENBERG: No, it does not. It means that the clerical staff, with three exceptions, I believe, and with the Assistant Director, Mr. Lincoln Lawrence, have left, but a small part of the clerical staff and Mr. Lawrence continue. In order to keep the office in operation, the University has reassigned certain persons and for a time brought people out

of retirement and has engaged new people, and the Admissions Office is now back on the track.

SENATOR DUMONT: I thought I noted that Mr. Schwab had been quoted as saying that the admissions policy as practiced in the Newark campus was actually discriminating against the black students in their admission to the Newark campus. I don't know whether he made such a statement or not but that's the way it was reported in the press. What have you got to say about the admissions policy and the practical manner in which it was operating with respect to black students?

MR. GREENBERG: There has never been to my knowledge and as long as we have the present policy within this University there never will be any discrimination against any student anywhere in the University on the basis of race, or any of the things which are contrary to law or to the intent of public policy or the intent of humanity. To my knowledge, and I think that you will hear from others later on today who have even more direct knowledge, this allegation is just not true. The fact is, Senator, that this past year the enrollment at Rutgers in Newark of black students increased, whereas it had been somewhere around - I'd like to defer to someone who is coming later who has specific figures - somewhere around 60 a year ago -

SENATOR DUMONT: You mean, the number 60, not per cent.

MR. GREENBERG: The number 60. I would like to take just a minute of your time to give you some specifics of minority group student enrollment at Rutgers in Newark and elsewhere in the University if you wish it, this year. I think I can locate it.

SENATOR DUMONT: I would be interested in seeing it, not only in Newark but, as a matter of fact, in all three of your campuses.

MR. GREENBERG: Senator, this has been published in a statement which, if it hasn't been made available to you, I am sure the University would be pleased to give that to you. I am sorry to delay you. I have a large number of papers. I can give that to you, sir.

SENATOR DUMONT: In order not to hold up the hearing, we will let that go for now.

MR. GREENBERG: I can say in answer to your question specifically that the enrollment of black students at Rutgers in Newark increased in the recent past academic year over the year ahead as a result of added efforts to attempt to recruit black students. The fact that the University had an occupation of a building for a period indicated to the black students that this activity did not occur as rapidly as they would have liked, not that there was discrimination against black students as black students. I think the statement is wholly untrue.

SENATOR DUMONT: You say you have had a number of conversations with students both before and after the occupation of the building. Have you got any concrete results to report in regard to whether you have actually in a concrete way accomplished some of these requests which I trust were reasonable that were made by the students?

MR. GREENBERG: Yes, again I would like to defer to a member of the faculty on one of them but I'll give you an illustration. There was a request for the institution of a

program of black studies. This Committee was in operation prior to the occupation of the building and included student representation, and the Newark College of Arts and Sciences faculty did indeed enact such a program.

SENATOR DUMONT: Thank you.

SENATOR HEIRING: Thank you very much. Next I will call Dr. Charles Pine of the Newark College of Arts and Sciences at Rutgers.

D R. C H A R L E S P I N E: Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee: I was asked to represent the College in two capacities today. One of them is as a member of a Special Report Committee. This Committee came about as a result of two resolutions. One of these was a resolution on March 6, this year, by the faculty of the Newark College of Arts and Sciences. The faculty adopted the following resolution unanimously and I will just summarize it.

"Believing that an incomplete picture of this college and its relationship to disadvantaged students and minority groups has been presented in recent days, the faculty of the Newark College of Arts and Sciences requests the Dean's advisory committee, with such faculty assistance as it deems advisable, to prepare a factual statement about the program's activities and actions which have been undertaken in the past and which are now in progress to recruit disadvantaged students and to help them overcome their problems in the University. This statement should be prepared as soon as possible and distributed with full publicity to press, radio, and television. "

In an additional action, on April 2nd of this year, the Council of Chairmen of the College passed a resolution which I will read.

[Reading] "The report transmitted to the New Jersey State Legislature by Chancellor Ralph A. Dungan on March 31, 1969, is in our opinion incomplete and misleading with regard to actions and attitudes of the faculty of the Newark College of Arts and Sciences.

"We cite in particular the statements in Finding No. 8.

"We request, therefore, that the Dean of the College inform the Chairmen of the Senate and Assembly Education Committees of our urgent desire to present to the Legislature all evidence and information relating to questions raised in the report."

This resolution was subsequently introduced at a faculty meeting and was passed, I believe, 106 to 1. It's an indication of the depth of feeling on the part of the faculty members in the Newark College that in a sense the faculty has been attacked and yet the members of the faculty feel that we have a good college and a good faculty, and the faculty was anxious to respond to this.

A Report Committee was selected by the Council of Chairmen to prepare a report concerning faculty actions and attitudes and, inasmuch as two members of the Dean's Advisory Committee were chosen to be on this Committee, it was decided to combine both of these resolutions in a single report. And this is the report which I would like to leave with the Committee today, and, if I may, I would like to summarize some of the main points that we are concerned about.

The report has basically two parts. One part of this report deals with questions relating to the admission of disadvantaged students and programs that were set up for

disadvantaged students. The second part of the report discusses other operations and program that we had and the way our committees operated. Really what this stems from, the reason for this sort of thing, is that there were allegations in the Chancellor's Report that the faculty in Newark was insensitive to the problems facing the college, primarily the problems of disadvantaged students, and also that the committee structure of the college was not working properly and that the faculty did not have a very good capacity for governing itself and running the affairs of the college.

There is a third section of the Report, which is in the appendix, and this is put in because of a very widespread feeling among people in the college faculties and students that the activities and events that took place during the occupation of Conklin Hall were not perhaps reported completely. There was a great deal of confusion, there were stories in the press, and there was an impression that the faculty would want a complete story about it in some coherent form, and to serve this purpose the Committee assembled various documents and put them together in an appendix as a background.

The programs for disadvantaged students that were undertaken at the college came about largely last year. What happened was that the Admissions Committee became concerned about the rather small number of black students at the Newark College and wanted to undertake recruiting activities to increase this number of students, and, along with that, there was concern about low grades at the college. So we had two areas of concern: one for the Admissions

Committee and one for our Scholastic Standing Committee. Since these were related to some extent, the members of the two committees began to meet jointly in informal fashion and evolved plans for first an active recruitment program for disadvantaged students and then, secondly, a program of help for these students - students who weren't perhaps quite fully prepared so that they could come in and succeed. The Joint Scholastic Standing Admissions Committee ultimately was formalized as a committee and became very active during the spring of last year and set up a visitation program to high schools having large number of disadvantaged students and sent out a call to faculty members to volunteer to go to these high schools, along with students, and urge students to come to our school. Some twenty faculty members volunteered.

The Joint Committee went on beyond that and during the spring and summer of last year set up a number of programs to help students who might not be prepared. Among these was a program of remedial reading. The Committee went to meet with members of the administration at New Brunswick and presented requests for money for such a program. There was a review program in mathematics given before the school term started. This was in the early fall. Then in the fall, along with the remedial reading program for some 90 students, there was a remedial mathematics program. The English Department cooperated in setting up special sections in English composition.

The Committee continued to function and, together with the Admissions Committee, began this first program we had for

this year, which took in some 90 disadvantaged students, began to formalize this and expand upon it and, as a result, what we have now for the coming year is a special entrance program. This is something aside from the urban university, this is something done earlier by the faculty of the Newark College - a special entrance program for between 125 and 150 students, and we are concerned now with trying to get enough money for this program. Last year, in a program during this last academic year, for the 90 disadvantaged students we had relatively little money to work with. It amounted all together to some \$19,000, of which about \$12,500 came from Equal Opportunity Funds and the other money came from some science funds and a few other things.

There was one program that was set up to help not only the disadvantaged but we decided to try this with all our students, and this was something we felt was rather unique, and it is described in here. This was a program of tutoring help for all of our freshmen students, the entire class, and what was done was to hire majors, students who were doing very well in different subject areas - mathematics, English, French, etc., and to have these students available on a regular schedule in specified rooms, and our freshmen students were notified that they could come at any time for tutoring free and as much as they wanted. This ran all week every week. This is a program we would like very much to continue. We think it was very successful and received a great reception from the student body, and this is the sort of thing we would like to continue.

There is quite a bit of discussion of an activity of this sort in here and a chronology of the Admissions Committee's program and the Joint Scholastic Standing Committee.

The other main topic that we want to address ourselves to was the question of the functioning of our faculty and its committee system and the way in which the college operates. Were we able to operate effectively? Were we willing to face the problems of the College? Were we going to try to improve our procedures at the College? Well, for one thing, our Scholastic Standing Committee had pioneered several years ago an appeals program for students who were in academic difficulty and who would be dropped, and provision was made that every student whose average was such that it was necessary for him to be dropped from the college was given the right of individual appeal and personal interviews were set up with members of the Committee, and a good many of these students were permitted to come back into the college as a result of this.

This particular activity of the Committee received quite a bit of attention and there are some quotations in here and copies of some journals which picked this up, education journals, and commented on the Admissions Committee and the Joint Scholastic Standing Committee, on some of its activities in remedial work and tutorial program.

Of particular application to the problem of college government and the way in which the faculty operates was

the Committee that was set up by a faculty resolution in May of 1968. The faculty itself had a feeling that improvements were needed in its procedures and the way in which the college should operate, and it voted a resolution to set up a committee called the Committee on Effective Faculty Participation in College Government, and this Committee later became known as Committee One. The Committee operated from May - it started right after the resolution and the faculty elected the Committee, and operated pretty much all through the summer, except for about one month, and into the fall of this year, and came up with what we feel is a very useful document for the college. It is contained in this report. We tried to improve our committee system, restructure our committees, we tried to look out for things we felt were behind the times. In previous faculty action, the faculty had voted to have student participation on a good number of faculty committees, but at the time this was done, this was without voting rights. The Committee One report, which has been adopted by the faculty now, specifically does grant the students voting rights on all faculty committees in which they participate. This does not include committees such as appointment and promotion.

One other committee which we think stands out in the type of activity which is relevant to this is a committee that was set up at the college in September of this year. The committee was set up by Acting Dean Talbott and is a

planning committee for the Newark College, the first time that we have had a planning committee. The Planning Committee set to work immediately and by November had prepared a planning document, in essence a master plan for the college. This was something we had not had before, and we presented this document called a model for the Newark College of Arts and Sciences to a meeting of the Board of Governors at the Newark campus on, I believe, November 22nd of last year in connection with our efforts to obtain more bond issue money. This planning document puts down our projections in student enrollment through 1978, the way in which we would like to grow, the balance between transfer students and freshmen coming in, and so on.

The Planning Committee is now working on an expanded version of this. This related primarily to our college and also made suggestions as to the structural arrangements between the Newark College and the central administration of Rutgers. What we are working on now is an expanded plan which takes into account the concepts of a university complex in Newark. We have met with Mr. Plehn of the Chancellor's Office who brought in the Master Plan draft and he has asked us to submit this to him when it's completed.

The second capacity in which I would like to speak briefly is for the Planning Committee, as a member of the Planning Committee, and also to try to convey the sense of the college, the sense of the faculty, the administration, and the students at our college in Newark.

There are three primary points I think that I would like to bring out briefly at this point. The first one is that we feel the distribution of money within the university has not been entirely equitable and we would like to see Newark get a greater share both in capital funds and in operating funds.

The second point on which there is a great deal of feeling among the people in Newark is that we would like to see some restructuring of the university which would lead to greater autonomy in Newark.

Then, third, and this stems from the other two: We would like to see a major university complex evolved in Newark. We think we have the people for it, we have the facilities, we have the schools that are ready to merge or perhaps cooperate in some way. We think that we could do a great deal for the people of northern New Jersey and perhaps for the people of the entire State.

SENATOR HEIRING: Are there any questions?

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: Dr. Pine, I am overwhelmed by your committee work. Just out of curiosity, how many hours do you think, or an approximation - how much time do you think, apart from your teaching, is spent in both the tutoring program for those who are having difficulties at Rutgers and in this committee work? What percentage of your time?

DR. PINE: Most of it, I would say.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: Is this with any compensation at all?

DR. PINE: No.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: I'm very impressed. The Master Plan that was talked about this morning which we haven't seen yet is the Master Plan for Rutgers University that I guess has been submitted to certain people and that the members of this Committee will get shortly. Does that Master Plan incorporate the Master Plan which you and your committee drew up?

DR. PINE: I don't know. I haven't seen it.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: You haven't seen it?

DR. PINE: No.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: Do you know if members of your faculty have seen it?

DR. PINE: Not to my knowledge.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: I should think it would have been drawn up in collaboration with some people in the Newark campus. Are you aware of any group in the Newark campus who worked with this Master Plan?

DR. PINE: No. I didn't hear about it until I saw it in the paper yesterday.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: I'm surprised. I have no more questions.

SENATOR HEIRING: Dr. Pine, you mentioned distribution of money to Newark as far as schools are concerned, greater autonomy, and you spoke of a major university in Newark. Speaking this way, are you advocating the divorcing of the Newark Rutgers from Rutgers?

DR. PINE: No.

SENATOR HEIRING: You are not?

DR. PINE: No.

SENATOR HEIRING: Are there any further questions?

SENATOR DUMONT: You said, Dr. Pine, about the fact that there were - I think you started to say a certain percentage or a certain number of black students on the Newark campus. Could you enlarge on that somewhat - whether it's been increasing each year?

DR. PINE: Yes. There was a great deal of concern among members of the faculty that we didn't have more Negro students inasmuch as we're situated right in the heart of Newark and we felt this was certainly a problem. The Admissions Committee had gone into this. I was not on the Admissions Committee until this past year so this is not of my personal knowledge. This is information obtained from people who were and is contained in the report. They had discussed this for several years with the people in the Admissions Office and were concerned about it, and they were told that the school certainly was and had been trying to recruit black students and other disadvantaged students but that these students didn't want to come to our school for several reasons, as I recall, which were told to me. One is that we had a reputation of being a pretty rough school - you know, good courses and so on and it wasn't too easy - and the other one was that students who had gone to high schools in ghetto areas and perhaps were disadvantaged in their home life wanted to get away when they went to school, and perhaps one of the reasons for some lack of success in high school was whatever disadvantages they had at home and that, if they

were able to go away to college and live somewhere else in a fresh environment they would do better. And since we don't have any residential facilities for our undergraduates, students would not be anxious to come to our school.

Now I think as a result of really quite extensive recruiting and programs - there were a number of programs set up last year and this year - the numbers of black and Puerto Rican students have increased very much. I think it went up something like 50 per cent from last year to this year and we are hoping it will go up quite a bit more for this year. There were a number of programs set up in addition to a visitation program where our faculty members volunteered to go out to high schools, talk to students, talk to guidance counsellors and arrangements were made for black students and other students to go with them preferably to the high schools from which they came, and urge the students to come to our school. We had that program and we attempted to set up another program where we would invite guidance counsellors to come into our school, talk with faculty members in an individual way and also invite high school teachers - somebody working in the same field - get to know him and convey something of the spirit of the school and that we had a heart and we wanted to help people.

We set up a program also where we tried to bring in every student who applied to our school to the campus. We hadn't done this previously. And many students or people on

the outside didn't know about our campus and that it was much nicer than it used to be. We have some very beautiful buildings now and it's an attractive place when students come there and they have an image of the place as it used to be, but they do find it attractive when they come. So we tried to set up a program of having faculty members volunteer in groups and meet with groups - I think we tried to set up 75 high school students at a time - bring them in, talk to them individually and try to counsel them and have tours around the campus.

A lot of this activity stopped when we began to have disturbances and things just got out of hand and we weren't able to cope with these other things. But these were things we started to do and we feel they are good things to do and we would like to do more of them in the future.

SENATOR DUMONT: Are you referring primarily to the faculty committee on admissions?

DR. PINE: No.

SENATOR DUMONT: Or the Admissions Office too?

DR. PINE: No. This was sparked by the Admissions Committee and the Joint Scholastic Standing Admissions Committee but it involved a great many of the faculty members. What we did was call members of the faculty. We went down a list and I think we had about 30 or 40 people volunteer for the high school visitation, 20 or 30 for greeting students on the campus, and about another 20 for meeting with guidance counsellors in their offices - have

them come to our place and have them taken to lunch and tell them about our school and show them what we were doing and what we had there.

SENATOR DUMONT: How much support on this did you get from the Admissions Office?

DR. PINE: They cooperated with us. There was no difficulty.

SENATOR DUMONT: There was no problem there?

DR. PINE: No, no problem

ASSEMBLYMAN WILENTZ: You apparently favor the creation of some greater university that would include all of the different college elements in Newark, if I understood your testimony correctly.

DR. PINE: Well, I would say that what we favor - and I think this is a sentiment that is very, very widespread; I mean, there is very little dissent from this in Newark.

We feel that we would like to grow and become a major center, and this would mean professional programs which we have now, a school of business, a school of law, and a college of nursing. We feel there is room for other schools which serve the State - things like a school of architecture perhaps - that might be opportune in Newark. And because of the fact that we have a college of engineering, which is right across the street from our campus, and we have a New Jersey College of Medicine and Dentistry, that this offers opportunities for cooperation and efficiency which perhaps does not exist elsewhere in this State. Of course, we would particularly

like to expand our graduate program. This is something that is a matter of a great deal of concern to everyone in Newark. We would like to have full graduate programs. We feel that we can be of great service in this way because there are so many people who are able to commute to our area who perhaps now go to school in New York to do their graduate work, and we could serve high school teachers for additional training -

ASSEMBLYMAN WILENTZ: The question I am asking is, do you favor including all of these institutions of higher education that are now in Newark within the umbrella of one university? Is that the basic thrust of what you are saying at this point?

DR. PINE: This is part of what the Planning Committee is studying.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILENTZ: You don't know what form it should take?

DR. PINE: No. This is what we are studying: What are the advantages and disadvantages? We are trying to arrive at some recommendation based on that.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILENTZ: I would assume that once you came to the conclusion, as I had thought that you had, in your prior testimony, which I must have understood, that there should be a greater university that includes all these things, I would think that the inescapable conclusion would be that Rutgers of Newark would no longer be part of Rutgers.

DR. PINE: No, this is not the conclusion we have come to.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILENTZ: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN HIERING: Any further questions?

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: Doctor Pine, I certainly want to comment you on the tremendous amount of work you have been doing. It is unfortunate that all of our people at the university do not do the same amount that you do. In the course of the work that you have done in the last two years in working with the students, did you get any idea that maybe they were going to come up with the confrontation they did come up with?

DR. PINE: No. This was a surprise.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: A complete surprise?

DR. PINE: Complete surprise to me.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: And since the disturbance have you had as much contact with the students as you had before or not?

DR. PINE: Well, I shouldn't give the impression - since I'm the one doing the talking here, I might give you the impression I'm doing all the work. This is by no means true, and actually we have many people who are more deeply involved with the aspects of this than I am. I have not been that particularly involved with the black students as such. There are other people who have been more directly involved in that particular way.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: What I wanted to ask was, are there other problems that you know of that have not been resolved or are coming to a boiling point that are not being handled properly?

DR. PINE: There is a problem which has manifested itself during the year and this is the discontent that our student body has in general concerning its facilities in

Newark - the question of money. Our campus center is entirely inadequate. We don't have a gymnasium and this is such a sore point, So as a result, we had a student strike which was a non-violent type of thing and one which most of the student body participated. Yes, I can say there is still a great deal of unhappiness in the student body about Newark and the money allocation, yes.

SENATOR HIERING: Are there any further questions?

[No questions].

Thank you, Doctor Pine.

Next, I will call Dr. Irwin L. Merker, Faculty Chairman of Admissions Committee, Rutgers Newark.

D R. I R W I N L. M E R K E R: Mr. Chairman, gentlemen: I do not have a prepared statement but I would like to say several things concerning statements that have been made this morning, particularly since I feel that I have been called here as Chairman of the Admissions Committee of the Newark College. I am going to deal at this point only exclusively with things involving our admissions program. There are two things that I just want to talk about. First is our special entrance program. This program goes back to last year and is continuing for next year with an increase in the number of students involved. Currently we are planning to have approximately 150 of our entering freshmen in the special entrance program. This is designed for disadvantaged students who show some sort of promise - not the normal criteria that we have used for our regular admissions but a student who might be high in his class even though his board

scores are low, moderately high board scores with low-class standing, or even low-class standing, low board scores but the recommendation of someone whom we know, a high school counsellor or someone in that line of work who says this is a good student whom we ought to give a chance to.

The program has been working for a year and has been moderately successful. With very little support from the university as a whole, with less than \$20,000, we have been able to take in about ninety students, and it seems as though the majority of them are going to be able to make it in our school.

For next year we have asked for \$100,000 and we have been given less than \$35,000 to take care of 150 students in this special entrance program. The special entrance program and the other programs that we have have done a great deal toward increasing the representation in our student body of minority group students. Last year the college as a whole had 60 black students. The college freshman class, the one we took in last year - last year's group of entering students had more than 90 minority group students, and the number of minority group students we hope is going to increase for this coming year although those figures are not yet in.

The other thing I wanted to talk about very, very briefly is the county colleges. There seems to be a great deal of problem about what to do with transfer students and our committee has been very much interested in this and, as you will see in the documents that Professor Pine left, our Master Plan calls for the acceptance of continuing growing

numbers of transfer students. Despite what has been said previously about the difficulties of it, we found that it was possible to run what we call an inverted pyramid. Ultimately by the time the thing gets going properly in the mid-1970's, we will be having more seniors and juniors than we have sophomores and freshmen, which is, of course, the exact opposite of most colleges, taking in large numbers of freshmen and slowing failing out numbers of them.

Anyway, those are the two programs I wanted to talk about, and now I am open to any questions that you might have.

SENATOR HIERING: Any questions?

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: The special entrance program, how will that blend into the so-called urban university program? Is it possible that the two are going to -

DR. MERKER: I don't think it should. Nobody has spoken to us very much about the urban university program but the special entrance program is not designed just for people from Newark, but it is designed for people all over the State. It's designed really for people who have shown some sort of promise. My bet is that any student from Newark who shows some sort of promise is probably already accepted into the special entrance program, and it's a limited group to be sure, but it was open to people from all over the State.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: Has this been going long enough so that you have any kind of indication of success for those students who are going through?

DR. MERKER: The figures that I know - and remember that the term has just ended - seem to indicate that at least two out of three people in the program are going to make it,

and maybe even more. And when I say "make it," I mean they will ultimately get a degree from the Newark College of Arts and Sciences.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: And how many people again are involved in this program?

DR. MERKER: For the current year we are planning on 150.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: One hundred and fifty, and it would take how much money, you think, to do this properly for the 150?

DR. MERKER: As we are doing it now, we are going to try to manage on less than \$35,000.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: You requested how much?

DR. MERKER: We had requested \$99,000.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: Was \$99,000 for the 150?

DR. MERKER: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: And you are going to try to make do on \$35,000?

DR. MERKER: Right.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: What do you use the money for?

DR. MERKER: Dean Robertson will be able to explain more about this but it's to hire people to give a remedial course in reading, remedial English, to provide psychological counseling and help to the students who will need this in the new environment, and so forth, and also for tutorials for the students if they get into any difficulty in their classes; there will be people available to them. We need money for somebody to organize it. Last year, Professor Strauzar in the Zoology Department organized the whole thing and apparently

it took a great deal of her time and energy and she was teaching at the same time and in addition has a family to take care of and, as a result, she found she didn't have time for anything. But this is basically what the money would be spent for.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: Well, the new program that the trustees and the governors were advocating was not discussed with your group at all?

DR. MERKER: Not before the governors decided to institute it.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: Did the governors know the program that you were putting forth there with this special entry?

DR. MERKER: I presume the people who were at the Board of Governors meeting knew about it.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: Well, have they made any effort to get together with you since they made this pronouncement?

DR. MERKER: There has been some sort of consultation but not very much.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: You don't know if the two programs will be tied in or not then.

DR. MERKER: The two programs will not be tied in. They are completely independent of each other, although we are hoping that perhaps we will be able to make up some of the funds that we didn't get by taking advantage of the facilities of the new Board of Governors program. For example, there are only five hours of psychological counseling for the entire student body at Newark - five hours per week, given by a non-certified person, a graduate student

who is going to be a psychologist. This, of course, is miniscule and we are hoping that if the Board of Governors uses the money that they are going to get properly there will be more psychological counselling which our disadvantaged students in the special entrance program will be able to use. We are hoping to use some of the money that we already have for this sort of thing.

The University has not taken very good care of Newark as you can see by these figures.

SENATOR HERRING: Is there anything further?

Assemblyman Owens:

ASSEMBLYMAN OWENS: Doctor, perhaps I missed it, but where do you get your students from for this special entrance program? You said they are drawn from all over the State but your actual methods of recruitment, what are they?

DR. MERKER: Normally the faculty has in the past gone out into the high schools and we particularly looked at the center city high schools in northern New Jersey and those high schools that we think will have large numbers of disadvantaged students. But any application that comes in that is rejected for our ordinary admission is looked at and considered for entrance under this special entrance program.

ASSEMBLYMAN OWENS: How long has this program been in existence?

DR. MERKER: This past year was the second year that it was in operation.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILENTZ: The entering student by this special entrance program enters as a freshman, doesn't he?

DR. MERKER: Yes, we take the students right into the college instead of, as at Rutgers College, putting them into a transition year.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILENTZ: There is no five-year course or anything like that?

DR. MERKER: Hopefully not, although the student may be required to go over a summer to make it up.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILENTZ: How does this program differ from the EOF program, the Educational Opportunity Fund program?

DR. MERKER: We are using Educational Opportunity Funds in this program.

ASSEMBLYMAN WILENTZ: So these 150 are part of these 1700 students throughout the State or -

DR. MERKER: I assume so.

SENATOR DUMONT: Are you drawing the same type of student as the program recommended by the Board of Governors at present envisions?

DR. MERKER: Probably not, although I suppose there may very well be some overlap. We look for some sort of promise. In other words, we have a limited program and we just cannot take anybody who applies, but the criteria that we normally look for in a student are really put aside. What we look for is some sort of hope that he or she is going to make it. It may be fairly high-class standing in a very poor school with low board scores whom we normally would not accept but we are willing to try in this special program.

This coming year, I remember one case of a student who had low-class standing, exceedingly low board scores, but who,

because of recommendations of people whom we knew and respected, we took into this special program for next year.

SENATOR DUMONT: Therefore, you don't necessarily pay more attention to the four-year record than the board scores or vice versa. They could be low in both.

DR. MERKER: They could be low in both, If only there is something, some indication that maybe the student is willing to work; for example, a veteran, somebody who had come out of high school with low board scores, low class standing, who had gone into the Army and then applied to us, might be accepted under this because we assume he is of greater maturity.

SENATOR DUMONT: You mentioned something about 90 people from minority groups. How many of those would be blacks, for example?

DR. MERKER: Most of them, if not all.

SENATOR DUMONT: Out of a total entering class of how many would the 90 represent?

DR. MERKER: 1100. It's more than 90 in the total entering group, not class, because we include transfers in this - slightly over 1100.

SENATOR DUMONT: It's around 10 per cent or close to it, a little less.

DR. MERKER: Thank you.

SENATOR HIERING: Anything further?

ASSEMBLYMAN CURCIO: I'm not quite sure, Dr. Mecker, that I understood the difference between the program for two years and the program which is envisioned by the Board of

Governors of Rutgers University, the urban university program. Can you give me a little more enlightenment on them?

DR. MERKER: There are oftentimes when I wish I had some enlightenment on this but basically, as I understand it, our program looks for people who have in some way, and it may not be the normal way, demonstrated that there is some sort of hope for them. The Board of Governors program seems to be designed for anyone.

ASSEMBLYMAN CURCIO: For those who have no hope to succeed?

DR. MERKER: Who have shown no ability at all.

ASSEMBLYMAN CURCIO: No ability at all. Well, who asked for this program?

DR. MERKER: I think you would have to ask the Board of Governors about that.

SENATOR HIERING: Is there anything further?

Thank you, Doctor.

Dr. Henry Blumenthal, Newark College of Arts and Sciences.

D R. H E N R Y B L U M E N T H A L: I have no prepared statement to make. I might perhaps comment on some of the points that have been raised here in the course of the deliberations today. As a new Dean since April 1st, I am looking forward rather than backward. I have been trying very hard to prepare the ground for the future in my relations with the students. I think it would be reassuring to you that I stated from the very beginning that

I would have an open door policy. Unless I am somewhere at a meeting or have an appointment schedule, our students and faculty can come see me at any time, and I think that this is a very wholesome change.

I might also point out to you that as Chairman of Committee One, whose report Professor Pine has made reference to, we have seen to it that a Student-Faculty Grievance Committee be established in every department, and there is a channel for students to raise the problems with not only the Chairman of the Department but also with other members of the Department. I believe this Student-Faculty Grievance Committee will do a great deal to bring about not only closer relationship between students, faculty and administration, but also should reduce the cause for any further disruption.

Since I've been Dean, we have in the first six weeks had four faculty meetings that gave the faculty an opportunity to discuss at quite some length quite a number of problems. Since that time and also since early April, we have formalized the presence of our students at our faculty meetings. This was a source of grievance with particularly the militant students who thought that the faculty and the administration were meeting in secrecy by keeping the students out from knowing about matters of direct concern to them. We are very happy that we finalized an arrangement whereby our students will now be present at faculty meetings as observers and, as Chairman of the Faculty Meetings, I have on several occasions called on the Student Council President to clarify matters so that the students would have an opportunity to express their

views.

Looking forward I should also report to you that we not only have instituted a program for Afro-American - African Studies composed next year of a number of courses given with respect to African or Afro-American culture. Our faculty has also approved of an urban studies program in which quite a number of our forward-looking students are interested.

We have been very active, as has already been stated, in recruiting black and Puerto Rican students in addition, of course, to the general students interested in coming to us and, as Dean of the college, I can report that come September this year we will have quite a sizeable increase in qualified - indeed in some cases highly qualified black faculty members.

So taking all these various steps together, I would hope that the causes which in the past have led to the most unfortunate disruption are gradually being removed.

Now I should add one more point which to me is very important. I have been trying to establish personal contact as much as my time permits. At the present time or during my first two months as Dean, I put in an 80 or 90-hour week to establish personal contacts with the leaders of the black student organization, with the leaders of the militant organization, and I of course have been in close contact with the representatives of the Student Council and I have already alerted most of the groups that before the next academic year begins in September I will want to sit down with them to find out what recommendations they have to make, what grievances they still have, in order to head off any future

trouble rather than to be confronted with it. So all together I don't want to paint too rosy a picture. The statements I have made are statements of fact and it would seem to me this is all we can humanly do at this particular time.

Now I could go on to quite a number of points that have been made here. I think by way of over-all direction that it is important for the Newark College of Arts and Sciences to remain a quality institution and yet, at the same time, we recognize that we have social responsibilities to the people not only in the city but in North Jersey and that we have responsibilities to the disadvantaged students. Whatever restructuring will take place in the university perhaps within the year, I would like to comment that to the best of my knowledge the faculty and students of the Newark College of Arts and Sciences will prefer to be part of Rutgers University, and even the development of a major urban university center in Newark would not necessarily mean that we would be spun off or separated from Rutgers. There are a great many advantages to us and I like to think that Rutgers as the State University also has an interest in having one part of its institution located in Newark.

Now the Committee One report about structures and procedures does raise a number of questions which will have to be discussed with the top administration in New Brunswick and I think the hearings here today and other opportunities will serve as a catalyst to speed up the re-structuring process. We do need in Newark, particularly in view of the fact that we

are a rapidly-growing institution, a high degree of administrative and fiscal autonomy. Of course, we will have to act in a highly responsible manner but there are many instances when decisions have to be made immediately by people who should be intimately informed about the problems and the personalities involved. I think there is probably no disagreement with the top administration in this respect.

Perhaps the greatest complaint that has been made over the years and is still being made by the faculty, administration at Newark, and our students, is that we have not been getting the kind of financial support necessary to operate a highly-effective institution. We realize that the university as a whole has many demands made on it but somehow we in Newark not only have to catch up with many years of neglect in the past, but we are confronted with considerable pressures, not only political pressures. In Newark itself and in the immediate neighborhood of Newark, there are many students, not just black and Puerto Ricans but whites too, who simply couldn't afford to go to a decent institution of higher learning elsewhere. I think this is a fact of the political reality in the State or in North Jersey of which we all have to take cognizance.

Perhaps it may not be out of place for me to use this opportunity to say that if we in Newark were to be allotted some thirty-five or forty million dollars for absolute construction, not stretched over the next ten years but over the next two or three years, most of our capital construction problems will be taken care of.

Perhaps, if I may respectfully suggest, all of us have not been thinking in large enough terms. I am a sound fiscal man when it comes to finances, I can assure you. Yet it would seem to me, with the pressures on us to build up the urban university center in Newark, with the cost of construction going up on account of higher wages and inflation, I think if we could expedite the construction of our physical needs, it would be in the interest of all parties concerned.

May I finally say very respectfully that while there is or was a real danger for students to conclude that they can get something only by resorting to illegal methods, there is a reverse side of the coin; namely, that we who have been trying to convince students, faculty and administrators that through the process of reasoning we should make progress or that perhaps those of us who are engaged in these hearings or in conferences, discussions and the like should realize that by coming through with the financial support we would head off those students, faculty and administrators who admittedly ask for a rapid filling up of our college in Newark.

I am open for questions.

SENATOR HIERING: Any questions?

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: As Dean of the College at Newark, did you take part in the Master Plan for Rutgers University, not the one that was drawn up at Newark itself?

DR. BLUMENTHAL: I did not participate in the Master Plan for Rutgers nor for the university as a whole. I have been Dean, you must remember, only since April 1st.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: Do you know if anybody else at Newark participated in that plan?

DR. BLUMENTHAL: I have no knowledge, no, sir.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: This restructuring of the university, do you have any indication that that is going to come about in the reasonably near future?

DR. BLUMENTHAL: I would think so. The Committee One Report, dealing with structures, procedures and decision-making processes was adopted by our faculty on May 15th; in other words, very recently. Since my office is greatly understaffed, it will take me two or three more weeks before the report with its various amendments and supplements are fully integrated and ready for distribution. Once that is done, I believe the discussion process with respect to restructuring could get underway.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: Do you believe under a reconstructed university that the bond allocation might have been done differently?

DR. BLUMENTHAL: I should think so. I would hope so. Now I realize the university made its plans many years ago and is essentially pursuing plans that have been devised a long time ago. And yet the political realities have been changing very rapidly during the last three or four years. The influx or the sociological composition, for instance, in the City of Newark, has been changing very rapidly and we cannot close our eyes to it. It is for the reason that the need, we feel, in Newark is so great and so urgent, that we have been quite

forceful in requesting the reallocation of the money.

SENATOR DUMONT: Dean, did you endorse the boycott of classes by the students?

DR. BLUMENTHAL: Yes, sir. I can explain this very readily. I had been in support of the reallocation of funds, of the bond issue money, and I had been Dean for a few days when the boycott was called. The first day of the boycott a sign was posted on the very thought that it would last only one day. And since I was in agreement with the substance underlying the boycott and since this was to last only for one day, and since I furthermore felt that my value as Dean would be not only limited but practically nil on this, I would be honest enough to live with my own conscience and support it. I did support it. And then when the boycott lasted a little longer, I requested several times that students return to classes, that the boycott had served its purposes and I could do only so much and the public had taken notice of what was going on and the important personalities in the State of New Jersey were paying attention to what was going on, so I requested students to go back. And, for that matter, I still was holding classes and I held my own classes, after three days of boycott.

SENATOR DUMONT: After three days you urged your students to go back. Is that right?

DR. BLUMENTHAL: Yes.

SENATOR SUMONT: All right. Thank you.

SENATOR HIERING: Anything further?

Thank you, Doctor.

Next we have Dr. John B. Robertson, Assistant Dean of the Newark College of Arts and Sciences.

D R. J O H N B. R O B E R T S O N: I don't wish to be repetitious and I think people from your Board have said a great deal. I would like to address myself to a couple of points. One, there seems to be some confusion between the College's special entrance program and the RUUP program, what are the differences between these programs, and I would like to briefly try to state what they are.

In the first place, the College's program was in existence before the RUUP program, in existence for two years. In the second place, the College program is not geographically limited, though in point of fact a large number of students who are in the program come from Newark but, nonetheless, if you do not live in Newark you can get in the College's program.

In the third place, the College's program is necessarily selective and as a result it probably is taking students whose level of achievement in some measurable fashion, whether it might be that the spark that somebody sees is greater and more readily apparent, there is some relationship between the RUUP program and the College's special program. We requested a budget of around \$99,000 and later amended it to \$130,000.

Our experience this year has been with a program that's been operated under an enormous budgetary limitation. Essentially, we could give some students some extra

tutoring, we could put them into somewhat different English sections. We gave them some remedial reading but what we lacked was any kind of administrative structure, any kind of counseling structure and, unfortunately, our college itself has virtually no supportive services in psychiatric counseling and things of that kind. So we put in a budgetary request of around \$130,000 to try to compensate for this.

The Urban University Program, Mr. Martin and myself hope, will enable us to secure some of these supportive services. We still do not have the funds for these services. We have now around \$35,000 but it is our hope that by cooperation with the Urban University Program we will be able to secure the counseling and the guidance.

We also now have an administrator to operate the program. Really we probably have more than \$35,000; we probably have around \$40,000 now for the program.

So there is that degree of relationship between these two programs.

The Urban University Program, on the other hand, hopes to educate simply a much larger number of people. Our College, I think, has a reasonable degree of pride in the fact that it was able to put its own program into operation. Indeed, it was the effort primarily of the faculty which brought that program into being, and it was the effort of people who, like Dr. Pine and Dr. Strauss at the College, worked just enormous amounts of time for which there would be, for practical purposes, no compensation, that kept the thing going. At the same time, you tend to

develop a certain amount of pride in what you're doing but from the standpoint of the Black student in our College we possibly had Black student trouble because we were successful in recruiting Black students. We increased from around 60 students to about 140 students. We trebled the number of Black students that we had in our incoming student body.

But from the standpoint of anybody looking around in Newark at the problems that Newark faces and then you look at what our College is doing, and it may be all that we can do. \$2 million, after all, for the entire Urban University Program is really just under two thirds of the entire budget of the Newark College of Arts and Sciences. We couldn't possibly undertake with the budget we have the kind of responsibility which the University is now attempting to assume. But, from the standpoint of the students, they could just look at the measurable educational institutions in Newark, they could look at a whole series of complex of colleges in the New Jersey College of Medicine and Dentistry and the Newark College of Engineering and ourselves and say, somehow it doesn't mesh, it doesn't fit sufficiently, enough of our people aren't getting here. And I think it was this kind of problem which certainly the Rutgers Urban University Program began to address itself to.

At the same time, I think it will be useful and I think this is what the Planning Committee of the College is attempting to do and this is what a lot of effort in the College has been bent to in the last year or two.

What does it mean to have an Urban University Program and what does it mean to be an urban university?

Certainly the kind of educational responsibility that is suggested by the RUUP program is an aspect of, but there are other things too. That's why we repeat, we consistently repeat, as Chancellor Dungan does also, that Newark needs a major urban university complex. We cannot meet with an on-the-whole, completely effectively organized series of educational operations in Newark.

The kind of problems that we are going to face in the City, partly we waste money, partly you have a library in the Newark College of Arts and Sciences, NCE has a library, and we're sitting next to, in many respects, a library which is better than both of them, the Newark Public Library which has all sorts of financial problems which it faces. You have much of the raw material really within a 4 or 5 block radius and I think people in the City and in the State can well ask us in the system of education what about getting these things together, what about making this system work, much of the raw material is there.

And there are things that aren't done. Why are many of these kids educationally disadvantaged. The Newark School System has its problems. Yet we have no urban school of education in the State. The Newark College of Arts and Sciences, for all practical purposes, has no education problem.

I am not trying to find fault. I am simply saying this is the fact and this is what we are suggesting, that we

need some kind of educational response adequate to the problems that we face.

So I think these things do come in together. That means adequate financial support; that means an intelligent and appropriate structure for this kind of affair. So that we can do not only what we have done, not only save money, but do a lot of the undone things which have to be done in the City, and so that you can have an urban university that is involved with far more than just educating a student here, so that you can have urban studies which indeed change the city and transform the city and that are accessible to people who live in the cities; that you can have social workers located in the cities; so that you can have a school of urban education and that you can have a complete range of educational programs and a complete range of academic accomplishments and a complete range of personnel.

If Newark is to secure, for example, adequate government, we need an administrative setup, we need people to be trained as administrators, we need a school of public administration and things of that sort to move in.

I'm a graduate of the University of Wisconsin where we have a very close blending between the State and the State University, wherein the people from the University have underwritten a large part of the accomplishments of the State, and I think that's what we hope to accomplish in Newark.

SENATOR HIERING: Are there any questions?

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: Is the special entry program available at Queens Campus, Douglass and Camden?

DR. ROBERTSON: I think each of the colleges has developed its own particular program and, frankly, I'm versed in my own program; I'm not terribly familiar with the programs at Douglass College. Douglass, I know, has worked on this kind of problem I think, frankly, before we did and with considerable effectiveness in the past. Rutgers College, it is my impression, is trying to go into what they call a transitional year which I take it is going to be somewhat different in style and substance from their own program.

I know the size of ours. About 150 students, out of around 900, and there will be 900 entering freshmen.

We also have made, I think more so than the other colleges, - and this, once again, is our choice; we have opted heavily for transfers, for a transfer student program in cooperation with community colleges. And, furthermore, every transfer student does not come from community colleges. Ninety percent of our transfer students, and we have by far the largest number of transfer students within the University, didn't go to community colleges, they're kids who went away to school for a year, their fathers discovered what \$4,000 a year meant and came to the conclusion that you have got to come back to the State. So you have a lot of people who want to transfer for various and sundry reasons.

I would also think that we would like to echo Chancellor Dungan's statement that there are many reasons for a community college - the kids just don't want to go away from home and you can spread community colleges all over the State. There are educational programs that will be there that will not be at a four-year college that the students want. There are people who want terminal degrees. These can be good places. And I don't think that this idea that you have this group here, this group here, and this group, - there's a tremendous overlap. There are people who go into community colleges who certainly could gain entrance into other colleges but they choose to go to that college. And I think we need a good quality community college system and we wish to operate in that fashion.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: I think there is one aspect that makes the Newark Branch of Rutgers certainly different from the Branch at New Brunswick and it hasn't really been commented on, not at least in detail, here today, and that is that you are basically a commuter college.

DR. ROBERTSON: That's right.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: Could you comment on what that means in terms of the lessening of cost to the student, in terms of their educational program and in terms of utilization of your facilities?

DR. ROBERTSON: Well, I think there are several aspects to that. In the first place it means the student himself, of course, doesn't have to pay as much money in order to go to our college. So in point of fact, you can

be a commuter and go to Rutgers College, you can be a commuter and go to other colleges in the State. Ours is an exclusively commuter college, and that's about the difference.

The fact that we're located in the City, more than the fact that we're a commuter college, means that our facilities are used intensively throughout the day. The University College operation is an extremely large operation. So I think it would be fair to say that on the whole, for that factor having to do with a commuter college, a classroom instructional building will get a large amount of use in Newark.

I think being a commuter college, we need certain facilities which we haven't had, we're trying to get them now. We need parking very badly. If we are going to have a commuter college - oh, it's easy to say people should ride buses and trains but the point of fact is an awful lot of people ride in cars. We don't have any parking on the Campus. We are trying to work that out. You don't need State money for that, this should finance itself.

I think also that our students probably need a little more, rather than a little less, in the area of psychological guidance and counseling and things of that kind, because in a sense they're still living in their homes. Many a student going to a dormitory college partly solves the problem of his family life being away from his family for a year or so. Our students do live at home and we have an awful lot of kids in academic trouble.

This is what the scholastic standing committee - this is what interviewing the students, that Dr. Pine referred to, really came out of. You interview kids who are in academic trouble and you find more than 50 percent of the time they are not in academic trouble but they are in some kind of personal trouble. This can range all the way from the fact that their mother is dying to the fact that they can't stand their mother. And you have to get some kind of solution to that sort of thing. So I think we need a fair amount of support in that area.

And these are some of the things that I can think of, offhand, to make a commuter college different.

SENATOR HIERING: Anything further?

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: In commenting on some suggestion, you've probably thought this over and worked it out and it probably never got to be a realization, but what would be interesting to see would be the industries in the Newark area coming out with some kind of a survey so that Rutgers would know what kind of technical people they would have to train, even if it would be a semi-educational, straight college course.

What is happening very basically I think with some of our urban students, even if they get the opportunity of going to a college they come out being prepared for nothing and especially in an urban situation which would probably be more frustrating to a student who has to return to his natural environment or back to his environment, which he cannot get out of. He should be taking some kind of courses in

college which would help him occupationally. Sometimes we only educate those and don't help those that need educational help and learning skills that will allow him to survive in an urban community.

DR. ROBERTSON: I think this is where articulation of a community college is extremely important. Our Chemistry Department has been extremely interested in this sort of thing. They have an NSF grant to articulate our programs with the programs of our 7 community colleges in trying to help these community colleges to develop programs that will permit students to transfer into the College. At the same time the Chemistry Department is interested in training chemical technicians because there is a considerable need on the part of industry for people who are professional but at the same time have not gone through a four year program. And I think if you grade between a community college here up to a doctoral program here, there are all sorts of different levels, really, which some kind of total and well articulated system could actually get at and actually begin to meet. College Professors in graduate programs sometimes ignore the need for people who are down in the community college. The community colleges seem to become very parochial institutions. So I think you need a tremendous range of different things to do exactly that kind of thing. For example, we have girls who graduate from college, four years, and they really can't do anything. They don't want to teach school. They could take legal stenography courses and things of that

sort in community colleges and they indeed might find that they were much more employable.

So I think one needs really a total range of educational programs in an urban university.

SENATOR HIERING: Anything further?

Thank you, Doctor.

At this time we will take a ten minute break.

(Recess)

SENATOR HIERING: I would like to call the meeting to order, please.

Our next witness will be Ralph Fucetola, III. Is Mr. Fucetola here? [No response.]

Then I'll call Frank J. Costanzo.

F R A N K J. C O S T A N Z O: Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee: I would like to thank you for giving me this opportunity to appear before you.

I have no prepared statement. However, I have a few comments that I would like to make.

Number one, it appears that just about everyone that has testified this morning and this afternoon have either defended themselves or the university. I feel that everything boils down to one issue, and a few people have touched upon it, but I would like to put it into one word and that word is money.

There were two basic issues in Newark this spring. The first one was the take-over of a building by the black students and then there was the student boycott of classes because of non-reallocation of bond money to the Newark campus.

I would like to talk specifically about the bond money. Last year, specifically last October, the Student Council, the last Student Council, asked the Board of Governors to reallocate the \$62.5 million from the '68 bond issue. They were told - namely, my predecessor was told - that it was not wise to bring up the issue at that time, it was going to be voted on in November and "Let's not make a mess out of it." So in November we had a dedication ceremony in Newark, at which point the Board of Governors

had a special meeting in our campus center and they met with several individuals of the student body and some faculty administrators. These individuals presented a series of statements and reports about the structure of Rutgers-Newark in relationship to the over-all university structure. It showed the inadequacies of the facilities and the need for more funds to go to Newark.

Last April, I believe it was April 2nd, the Board of Governors made their final decision on the reallocation of bond funds and the Student Council called a boycott of classes to dramatize their plight to the Board of Governors and to the citizens of the State. We were very successful, I believe, in bringing it to the attention of the important people in the State, namely, this body and the legislators and, of course, the citizens.

You see, New Jersey has most of its citizens in the northern part, the northern half of the State, and Rutgers-Newark is the only 4-year Liberal Arts college in that area. We are a commuting school. Therefore, we can handle many more students.

The Board of Governors is going to build three residential campuses in the Kilmer complex. We have objected to it. We have shown everyone that has asked and everyone contacted why we feel that their plan is not the best. We have received the support of the newspapers, the faculty and the administrators in Newark and we have received the support of distinguished members of the Assembly and Senate.

Now I have a problem. I have to go back. I have to go back to Newark and I have to tell the students how things went in Trenton. The reason I say it is a problem is because the channels, the legal channels, that are available to us have reached the

pinnacle. In other words, we are at the top. It is my hope, my sincerest hope, that something constructive will come out of this hearing in the form of re-evaluation of some people's thinking about education, on the general spectrum of higher education throughout the State and also as applied to our campus in Newark.

I would like to just make a few comments about some of the inadequacies of our campus because no one has touched upon it yet. Those of you who appeared in Newark and met with some of us this past semester know about them, but I would just like to say a few words to those others who weren't there.

First, our library and our cafeteria are inadequately funded through the university. We have a gym of sorts, but we cannot play basketball games there. We have to go to another gym. Our gym is entirely too small. If you would see it, you would definitely believe it. There are no parking facilities for students. We have a temporary lot which will be taken up by a new chemistry building, which I think is fine, of course.

As far as Chancellor Dungan's statement about the separation of the Newark campus, I think I can speak for the students in saying that we would like to retain the name of Rutgers, but if somebody were to spin us off, it could only be feasible if we were to be included in a conglomerate, a major complex, that would include the three other campuses in Newark. I don't expect this to happen in the very near future, but in the interim, I think it is important that the administration in Newark be granted some type of authority because right now there is immense responsibility, but there is no authority, and I think that is

something that has to be looked into.

Any questions, please?

SENATOR HIERING: Are there any questions?

Tell me, did your group, the Student Council, bring this problem to the Board of Governors prior to the voting on the bond issue?

MR. COSTANZO: That is correct.

SENATOR HIERING: Because as I recollect, the distribution of the bond funds was determined in advance and many of the people who advocated the bond issue campaigned for it around the State and said, "Here is where the money is going." Did you complain at that time prior to the bond issue being brought up or didn't you know about it at that time?

MR. COSTANZO: I did not personally. I was not in office at the time. My predecessor did communicate with Dr. Gross and, as I stated previously, he was asked not to create any kind of a stir over it because it had not come up for a vote yet, but it was promised that it would be looked into after it was approved by the voters.

SENATOR HIERING: Could you ask him?

MR. COSTANZO: He is not here at this time.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: Mr. Costanzo, what are the primary reasons you feel that the bond allocation was not altered in any way to benefit the Newark campus? In fact, while I am speaking of that, I am in favor of that particular alteration, the bond money being changed from one campus to another.

MR. COSTANZO: My personal reason why they didn't change it?

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: Yes.

MR. COSTANZO: Well, it perhaps goes back to the Black issue, you know, the BOS issue, the take-over of Conklin Hall, where the Board of Governors had received publicity over the new program and perhaps following right behind that came the bond issue strike, the boycott. Perhaps in their thinking, it would look very foolish to condescend.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: You believe because the Newark Campus had a poor image, is that the reason why the Board of Trustees did not alter this bond money?

MR. COSTANZO: The Board of Governors?

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: Yes.

MR. COSTANZO: Because Newark had a poor image? I don't believe Newark has a poor image.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: No, but what I am trying to get at: What were the concrete reasons why this recommendation was turned down by the Board of Governors?

MR. COSTANZO: Sir, I would like to know also.

SENATOR HIERING: Any other questions?

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: Just to elaborate on one point, Mr. Costanzo, a representative of the student body of Newark came to see the Board of Governors prior to the passage of the bond issue and was told not to complain then, that hopefully the meeting would occur after the vote and it would be rectified at that point?

MR. COSTANZO: This is what I was told by that individual. Yes, that is correct.

SENATOR DUMONT: Can you tell us how the student body at Newark feels about the proposal made by Dr. Gross and the Board

of Governors?

MR. COSTANZO: Which proposal?

SENATOR DUMONT: This new one of taking in 875 students approximately at a cost of \$2 million.

MR. COSTANZO: The students are very conscious, are very intelligent and perhaps maybe a little liberal. They think that everyone should be granted an opportunity to go to school. So I would say the student body is in favor of it.

SENATOR DUMONT: The majority of them then would favor the plan?

MR. COSTANZO: The majority.

SENATOR DUMONT: Thank you.

SENATOR HIERING: Anything further? [No response.]

Thank you very much.

Next is Mr. Ralph Fucetola.

R A L P H F U C E T O L A, I I I: Thank you for calling me a second time. I was out putting the money in my car meter.

I have a prepared statement, but before going into that I would like to say that I think Frank Costanzo's comments were essentially well taken and needed to be said today.

During the recent crisis at Rutgers University, I was chairman of the Rutgers Newark Young Americans for Freedom and Executive Director of the YAF state organization. At that time, the Coalition for a Peaceful Campus, of which group I am co-chairman at this point, was not formed. I am now a third year student at Rutgers Law School in Newark and a graduate of Rutgers College in New Brunswick.

My discussion will center on YAF's actions before and

during the present crisis and I will recommend certain measures which will obviate future crises. The situation reached its climax with the occupation of Conklin Hall at Rutgers-Newark. On the Thursday before the occupation, we wrote to Governor Hughes, President Gross and others warning them of the impending crisis and urging them to protect our rights and remain firm in the face of racist-extremist demands. Unfortunately neither of the gentlemen responded to our timely warning. Upon arriving at school and discovering that Conklin Hall had been occupied, we issued a statement making four requests to the University:

1. No amnesty.
2. No surrender to racist-extremist demands.
3. Police protection on campus.
4. Suspension or expulsion of all who commit crimes on campus.

Our requests were reinforced by the similar positions of the Rutgers-Douglass and Rutgers-Camden chapters of YAF. We also notified the University of Chapter 395 of the Laws of 1968 which makes blocking access to a school building a high misdemeanor. In addition we visited county and city law enforcement officials informing them of this new law and requesting that it be enforced. YAF also sent a special delivery, registered letter to the Governor, reminding him of the law which he signed not quite two months before and asking him to do his duty by enforcing it. Needless to say, the public and University officials involved displayed a shocking unwillingness to act.

During the occupation we attempted to join with others in

a "majority coalition." Our efforts failed at that time, but the nucleus of the New Jersey Coalition for a Peaceful Campus was formed, and by working with students and individuals in the community, we helped to avert a violent clash. I should point out that Vice President Talbott told me that police would be called to prevent a liberation of Conklin Hall. Note that the University would not use justified force against the criminal occupiers, but was willing to use force against students attempting to enforce their rights.

The occupation ended with Gross' and Talbott's ignominious surrender to racism. One of the documents they signed, for example, committed the University to admit all black Newark high school graduates with more than a 400 on their verbal SATs and in the upper half of their classes. The "new" admissions policy of Rutgers should be studied as an implementation of that illegal and discriminatory agreement. Other elements of this agreement were equally in violation of this State's civil rights laws as well as Federal law. For example, several salary lines were set up for specifically black administrators. Chancellor Dungan and the State Board of Higher Education had a hand in this violation of law by providing one of those lines. Another aspect of that dishonorable agreement transferred two white administrators from Rutgers-Newark because of their race.

If I can add an aside, one of the BOS statements indicated that the black students needed a victory, needed the destruction of these two white administrators as a symbolic act. They were transferred.

Gross and Talbott complied with all of these absurd

demands, thereby proving that they are unfit for their positions and unworthy of respect or belief.

After the occupation ended, we continued to oppose the racist agreement made by the University. Our position has the support of most students and faculty. During the occupation, a poll conducted by the Student Council showed that 75 per cent of the students opposed the BOS demands. The faculty rejected the first version of the "new" admissions policy by about 2 to 1. They were not allowed to vote upon the final plan even though the University Regulations (Page 50.19, Rule 7.20, Book II) provide that the faculty controls admission policy.

The situation after the occupation and surrender has become much worse. During the occupation, as you may know, Black Panthers in full uniform "camped out" in our Law School lounge. Since then, the open presence of black and white radicals has continued. Acts of violence are becoming common. On one day several weeks before classes ended, four people were assaulted on campus: two teachers and two female students. One teacher was assaulted as he left a faculty meeting. He had the courage to vote against the wishes of the new left fascists at a previous faculty meeting. Those who attacked him were "punished" by the University - they had to apologize to him. Both girls and this faculty member are members of a student-faculty group involved with our Coalition for a Peaceful Campus.

We have learned a great deal from events at Rutgers. The University is unwilling to protect students and provide a free academic environment. The State is either unwilling or unable to enforce its own laws. We have learned that all the talk about

equality under law is a lie. Those in power still practice illegal discrimination, only now it is of a reverse kind.

I believe that I can make several suggestions based on my experiences. First, I am convinced that State-controlled education is as destructive of progress and freedom as State-controlled religion or State-controlled enterprise. Ideally, there would be no "State" university. But until our society progresses toward a sufficiently laissez-faire condition, we must work to make the present statist system more just. I, therefore, make five specific suggestions on legislative measures:

1. Do not assist the so-called "new" admissions policy, rather outlaw it as racially and geographically discriminatory.

2. Require all public education and State college or university officials to protect students and faculty from acts of violence.

3. Reform control of the University so that the four groups most interested in the University have a voice at the highest levels. These groups are the alumni, parents and students, the faculty and the taxpayers.

4. Increase private and public higher education by permitting tuition fees to rise and making guaranteed loans available to all students.

5. Create a commission to study ways of decentralizing and privatizing all education in New Jersey.

If I can very quickly address myself to 1 and 4 again, I have noted in State law, Title 18:22-15.42, Section 10, that the Board of Governors has the authority to authorize any new educational department if the department is approved by the

State Board and if provision is made for it by the State Legislature. I suppose that this new urban university is such a department and, therefore, for it to exist, you gentlemen would have to act affirmatively. I urge you not to act affirmatively, but rather because of the discriminatory nature of this department which would only allow people from certain specific geographical areas in and, of course, given the type of geographical areas would de facto segregate on the basis of race. I think this particular type of department would be highly discriminatory and probably violates the 14th Amendment among other things.

On the fourth point, increasing education by increasing tuition, I think the taxpayers of New Jersey have probably had just about enough taxes. If we look at the present situation, we realize that students in New Jersey are really only paying a fraction of their own education. Certainly when you become a college student, when you are about to receive a vote, as a matter of fact I suppose all college students will be voters by this time next year, when you are in that situation, when you know you are going to be earning quite a bit of money upon graduation, I see no reason why you as a student cannot pay for your own education. By raising tuition fees, for example, about \$1000 a year, Rutgers-Newark could raise another \$4 million or so, which would certainly go a long way toward solving its problems.

Now the guaranteed loan program is probably very useful in that it does not amount to a very large outlay of State funds and it puts the burden of education where it ought to be, on the person who benefits from the education and not on the people who pay taxes. And it also enables us to increase education

rapidly.

Are there any questions?

SENATOR DUMONT: How large is your chapter?

MR. FUCETOLA: Thirty-five national dues-paying members on the Rutgers-Newark campus.

SENATOR DUMONT: Well, do you have any members on the New Brunswick campus?

MR. FUCETOLA: Yes, about the same size and Camden, somewhat smaller.

SENATOR DUMONT: Well, do you have three different chapters?

MR. FUCETOLA: Yes, for the three different campuses.

SENATOR DUMONT: One for each campus. Now you heard Mr. Costanzo say that he thought the majority of the students would approve of the plan suggested by the administration.

MR. FUCETOLA: All I know is that a poll conducted during the occupation seemed to indicate that about three-quarters of the students opposed the BOS demands. Now among those demands, of course, were the demands on admissions. Therefore, I assume about three-quarters of the students would maintain their opposition to that sort of admissions policy. My assumption is also that the so-called new admissions policy is merely a covered-up version of the BOS demand and nothing new at all.

SENATOR DUMONT: There were quite a number of demands made by BOS.

MR. FUCETOLA: Yes, quite a number.

SENATOR DUMONT: And this was one of them.

MR. FUCETOLA: Yes. The students seem to have rejected

them in toto, at least in this poll, which only reached, I believe, only about 800 students out of the total enrollment. That may have been a representative sample.

From talking to people on campus, from what I can tell anyway, there seems to be a good deal of opposition to opening the doors of Rutgers to students regardless of their academic achievements and opening the doors of Rutgers to students on a very selective geographical basis.

SENATOR DUMONT: These acts of violence that were committed --

MR. FUCETOLA: -- are being committed.

SENATOR DUMONT: What?

MR. FUCETOLA: It is a continuing process.

SENATOR DUMONT: Well, is there any organization behind those?

MR. FUCETOLA: I really don't know. I assume the University should investigate and find out.

SENATOR DUMONT: How large is the Students for a Democratic Society Chapter at Rutgers?

MR. FUCETOLA: It is hard to say. They sometimes have 25 or 30 people at a meeting. I have seen meetings at which they have had almost 75 members. At least, we have had people in meetings where they have had 75 members. They had, after the boycott turned into a strick, a loss of support of all the responsible elements on campus. They had 150 or so people picketing in front of the library and making lots of noise. I don't know whether that shows their strength or not.

SENATOR DUMONT: Do you have as many people out

at your meetings as they get at theirs?

MR. FUCETOLA: No.

SENATOR DUMONT: How much opportunity and time do you have since you are a student at the Law School to check on the sentiment among the student body?

MR. FUCETOLA: I talk to people in the Law School and my friends in the undergraduate school talk to their fellow students. You know we are pretty close together. My school building is across the street from Conklin Hall, for example.

SENATOR DUMONT: But most of your conversations were with students on the Newark campus, right?

MR. FUCETOLA: Oh, yes, of course.

SENATOR DUMONT: You don't get to New Brunswick and Camden.

MR. FUCETOLA: Well, let's see, I talk often to my Chapter people down there; as Executive Director of the State YAF, I have great opportunity to talk to them. I don't know if they reflect accurately what the people down on their own campuses are saying. I also have other friends at Rutgers-New Brunswick since I graduated from there a couple of years ago.

SENATOR DUMONT: You mentioned two people from the admissions office. Were you referring to Mr. Schwab and Mr. Miller?

MR. FUCETOLA: Yes. And the reaction, by the way, of the employees of the university to their removal - transfer - was much, much more angered than President Gross suggested earlier today. We talked to some of the secretaries anyway and they were

fit to be tied.

SENATOR DUMONT: Do you think there will be more lateral transfers after today's testimony?

MR. FUCETOLA: I don't know. Perhaps they could start with President Gross and Vice President Talbott and transfer them somewhere.

SENATOR DUMONT: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: Mr. Fucetola, maybe you can recollect for me and generally tell the Committee exactly what life was like those few days of the seizure at Conklin Hall or the developments at Rutgers?

MR. FUCETOLA: Hectic. We arrived at school, you know, the normal time and I walked out from the subway and saw a large crowd by Conklin. I had sent that letter a few days beforehand. I didn't know how soon the crisis would reach a head. We knew something was happening. Indeed we were told later that lots of people on campus knew something was about to happen, but nobody seemed to be able to do anything. We arrived and the building was taken and we didn't know quite what to do. I met with the Vice Chairman of my Chapter and we decided to divide our efforts. He would try to keep the crowds large and calm and I would try to get out press releases and that sort of thing. As the time wore on, it became obvious they would be staying there for a long time and we began talking to people. We were running from place to place in Newark, from the County Court House to the City Hall and all around trying to get some sort of assistance, trying to convince the university that it had to open up the school right away or face defeat, face an unacceptable

agreement.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: Do you feel that the student body at large respects the administration at Rutgers?

MR. FUCETOLA: No, certainly not all the members of the administration. There are a few people - the new Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, for example, is highly respected. As a matter of fact it seems the people on the faculty are much more respected now than ever before, whereas the people in the administration are much less respected. It would seem the faculty took a strong stand, though it was overruled by the higher echelon.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: At the present time who decides on the admissions policy?

MR. FUCETOLA: No one quite knows. I went through and delved into all the documents. I tried to get a copy of the original charter of the university, but unfortunately there doesn't seem to be very many around. I do have a photo copy of it and I have read it. I don't know what the amendments of recent years say, but to go back to that ancient document of 1766, it says, if I can quote, "The officers and ministers of the college shall exercise the same authority as the lesser officers and ministers of our colleges in England." Of course, I don't know what His Majesty's colleges in England did in 1766. But I would like to point out that State law, Title 18:22-15.54, clearly states that no State law can in any way abridge the charter because to do that, of course, would be to abridge a contract. Therefore, I assume whatever powers the faculty has under the charter, it has now.

The university regulations are very clear. They state that the faculty Senate sets standards and each faculty group on each campus can set higher standards but not lower standards, only higher standards.

The State law seems to lay out very clearly what the Board of Governors' authority is; though it mentions hiring and firing of faculty, though it mentions setting up new departments, it does not mention admissions policy.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: Well, what do you believe is being done now? I mean, what is reality?

MR. FUCETOLA: Well, having talked to a couple of faculty members, I am as confused as they are. I don't know what is being done. I don't think anyone does. I do know from what New Jersey laws look like it seems you people have to approve any new department being set up, of any new university-wide special college they may want to set up.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: At the time of the seizures at Newark-Rutgers, how many students do you believe took over this building?

MR. FUCETOLA: That is very hard to say. I really don't know.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: How many people do you think were involved?

MR. FUCETOLA: In the windows of the building, I may have seen as many as a dozen people at any one time. Outside as soon as the BOS people took over, the SDS being the vanguard of revolution ran up and started picketing. And there were perhaps 50 or so of them running around in circles outside the building,

showing how revolutionary and "with it" they were. But inside the building, I don't know.

ASSEMBLYMAN CAPUTO: Thank you.

SENATOR HIERING: Anything further?

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: One question: How many students do you think missed classes that would have liked to attend classes that day?

MR. FUCETOLA: I assumed that everybody missed classes and I hope classes are exciting enough so that everybody wanted to attend. My own school did not officially close classes at the time during the crisis. But the few classes I was able to attend had about one-third attendance. Of course, the undergraduate classes were closed. At one point it was so confusing in the undergraduate division that the only way you could know whether a class was meeting or not was to check on the glass door of the library to see if a sign was up with the university official seal impressed into it that said your class was going to meet.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: Classes were available to those who wished to attend?

MR. FUCETOLA: No. Some classes were available some of the time.

SENATOR HIERING: Anything further? [No response.]
Thank you, sir.

MR. FUCETOLA: Thank you.

SENATOR HIERING: Next, Miss Mary Jane Williams.

M A R Y J A N E W I L L I A M S: I suppose to keep in step with everyone else today, I should begin by saying I do not have a prepared statement. However, I have written some notes about things that came up during the course of the proceedings and I would like to talk about them.

First of all, I would like to vindicate myself. When Dr. Gross said that there was no hockey rink at New Brunswick after I had written that the Board of Governors' Committee authorized its purchase - that was the point. The Committee on Buildings and Grounds of the Board of Governors authorized the purchase of a hockey rink at the same meeting that they authorized renovations for one of our buildings in Newark. But it took them three months to authorize the renovations because they thought they were too expensive. They wanted to cut out modernizing the elevators. Students need to climb stairs because we don't have a gym. So it's part of the physical fitness program.

Assemblyman Kean mentioned before that Newark has developed the idea that it is a second class part of the university and I think that Dr. Gross denied that or at least said that everyone feels that way. There are a couple of examples of things that have happened over the years that I think point out that in many respects Newark is a second-class part of the university.

In January of 1966, the Board of Governors Committee on Buildings and Grounds met and very, very reluctantly decided to spend \$5,000 to renovate a lecture hall at 53 Washington Street. You may remember that on Christmas Eve of '65, there was a fire at the Military Park Hotel that destroyed the ballroom and that

is where all large lectures were held. When Duffield Hall was destroyed the hotel gave half of its deposit back to the university. That amounted to \$2500. The other \$5,000 needed in order to accommodate the large lecture groups in 53 Washington Street had to come from the university. They didn't want to spend that much money. However, at the same meeting they voted to ask the Board to spend \$6,490 on in-door practice facilities for the Rutgers crew team because, and this is a quote, "The Rutgers crew has always been handicapped by a lack of in-door practice facilities."

There is another aspect of this which becomes very involved with the bond issue. In September of 1966 - and at that time I believe I am correct in saying that Rutgers University had the only degree school of nursing as opposed to a diploma school - the Committee on Educational Planning and Policy - this is a Board of Governors Committee - said, and this is a quote, "First priority should be given to allocation of land and matching funds so that government funds can be sought for a college of nursing building." That was in September of '66. Now after that time, an allocation for a college of nursing building was put into the bond issue planning for the university. But in September of '68, it was suddenly taken out. For a first priority need, this is indeed puzzling and this is typical of what happens to Rutgers-Newark. Of the approximately \$6.9 million that was taken away from the university, almost \$3 million - I believe it was \$2.9 million - was supposed to be used for a nursing building which would have been part of the Chemistry Building complex. It would have been a combined

Chemistry-Nursing Building. This money was taken away after the Board, itself, had said this was a first priority need.

Many of the people in the College of Nursing are becoming very concerned because over the years the rating of the Rutgers College of Nursing has steadily been declining because of their lack of facilities. They have absolutely no nursing facilities, no nursing laboratories or classrooms of their own. In fact, Dean Chapman of the College of Nursing points out that she always gets a little nervous when the girls start their floor work because that's the first time they ever do a procedure and it is always on a patient. She is afraid something terrible is going to happen one of these days.

Most of the things that we really feel are terribly wrong with Rutgers-Newark and can be righted by the university were explained when we invited every member of the Legislature up on a Saturday to Rutgers-Newark. Only four people showed up, but I guess that is a good showing anyway.

I remember that I was on the group that took Assemblyman Kean and Assemblyman Rinaldi around the campus. And when we got to the block on James Street in Newark which houses most of the faculty offices, at least for Humanities and Social Science, I can't remember which one, but one of the gentlemen pointed out that if welfare clients in the State of New Jersey were housed like that, they would be pulled out of there and the building would be condemned. That's the kind of facilities we have at Rutgers-Newark.

There were a couple of things that Ralph said that I would like to comment on because I think they are somewhat

inaccurate and they give a slightly wrong impression. First of all, the Student Council poll that he mentioned was done very hastily and unfortunately it was very badly worded. A psychology major, a friend of mine, was so upset about it that he couldn't speak for days. What they did was they asked whether students agreed with all of the BOS demands. I think that possibly the only one who agreed with all of the BOS demands was Joe Brown. [Laughter.] So to ask the student body at large whether they agreed with all of them and answer "yes" or "no", led to a very, very misleading kind of thing.

Another thing was that classes were rescheduled when Conklin was taken. The Registrar's Office did a fantastic job of getting people into classes. They were held in very irregular places, but they were held. Of course, I am not very much an authority on this, perhaps as much an authority as Ralph who does not go to our school, because I missed some classes then; being the editor of the paper, I was always elsewhere. But the first day that the building was taken, Monday, I don't really think that many classes at all were held. If they were, it was more a matter of a faculty member grabbing a student and saying, "Hey, do you want to have class?" But from Tuesday morning on - and the building was also closed Thursday even though they came out five o'clock Thursday morning - classes were held except for the 8:40 classes. They couldn't get them rescheduled and get the information up fast enough to allow students to get to class. But other than that, classes were held. They were held in empty offices in the campus center. They were held in the basements of other buildings and on the

grass if the weather was nice, which it wasn't always because it was February. But classes were rescheduled and many, many students went to classes.

One thing also that I would like to clarify a bit, if I may, is the bond issue thing. The changes in the university's request for bond issue money were not agreed upon as far as I know until September of '68. That's when the list was sent out. So no one in Newark had knowledge of the fact that our allocations had been changed. Up until that time, the \$6.9 million that we feel we should get was on the list. No one was directly informed in Newark. When people in Newark found out about it, some sort of action was planned. On October 4th of that year, '68, the dedication of the campus in Newark was held and most of the members of the Board of Governors were there at that time. Carl Wyhoppen was President of the Student Council and Carl made an official request of President Gross for the Board to hold a special meeting and hear pleas from people in Newark for the allocation to be changed back to what it was before. Perhaps I shouldn't go into this because I wasn't there, but Carl told me, and he was very furious about it too, that Dr. Gross assured him that if the meeting could be put off until November 22nd everything would work out. Carl refused this saying that Dr. Gross could always say, "Well, the voters voted on it that way," and that if something wasn't done before that time, people in Newark would campaign against the bond issue rather than have this go through the way it was. Dr. Gross said, "Please don't do that. We need the bond issue money and we will settle your problems after it passes." And Carl

agreed to that. That is why the special meeting was not held until November 22nd and why there is a great deal of confusion about the fact that it was passed in the form that it was.

That is about all I have to say.

SENATOR HIERING: Are there any questions?

SENATOR DUMONT: Do you then agree with Mr. Costanzo about the student support of the new admissions policy rather than what Mr. Fucetola said?

MISS WILLIAMS: I am not really sure about that. I don't know whether I can say. I think that at this point there is not general support for it on campus. I don't know whether there will be. Part of the problem is that almost every resolution that the Board passes is vague and the one that they passed at their special meeting when they created the urban program was vaguer than anything I have ever seen. So there was a great deal of confusion and panic among the students and the faculty as to what exactly this would be. Actually there hasn't been much clarification of that as yet. Most of the articles that have been in the newspaper are fairly vague and I understand even reports that have so far come out are vague because the program is being worked out. Possibly when it is completed, the students may feel that it is a good thing. Right now, I don't think that most of them feel it is good.

Another problem too is that this will mean 400 extra people on our campus. Now our campus is terribly small. The facilities that we have right now are very small for the student body we presently have. To put 400 extra bodies on campus in itself is kind of disturbing. So I really don't think there is

a good deal of support for it, but there might be when it is explained.

SENATOR DUMONT: All right, then you think most of the students are against it at the present time --

MISS WILLIAMS: Yes, I think so.

SENATOR DUMONT: [Continuing] -- until they know more about it, at least?

MISS WILLIAMS: I think so, yes.

SENATOR DUMONT: What was the feeling on the campus in regard to what was done with the people or the personnel in the admissions office?

MISS WILLIAMS: From two or three general student body meetings that were held around that time, I think that most students were shocked and upset about it because they felt that it was done without much basis and that it was sort of done very shiftily. All of a sudden Schwab and Miller were no longer there simply because BOS stated they weren't doing their job correctly.

I think that most students were upset about the whole thing. It was a very emotional time. The aspect of it that was most upsetting, and I think still is, is that BOS got what they wanted, which they did actually. I remember one time there was a convocation with Mr. Talbott and Mrs. Hill, who is a member of the Board of Governors, and someone asked Mrs. Hill why BOS got what they wanted and she said, "Well, they were the only students who were in the active revolt against the university at the time." So everybody said, "Well, is that what you have to do? Do you have to be in active revolt?" I think she just

smiled. But it is a very irritating point. Other people have worked and gone through channels and done everything they can to reach people and to explain their problems and have gotten no response and a group of kids run out and seize a building and all of a sudden they have got everything they want. It is difficult to accept that kind of thing happening.

SENATOR DUMONT: Was the feeling on the campus that this represented capitulation on the part of Dr. Gross and Dr. Talbott to the demands of BOS?

MISS WILLIAMS: I think that a large part of the student body felt that way, yes.

SENATOR DUMONT: Thank you.

SENATOR HIERING: Anything futher?

MISS WILLIAMS: There is one other thing that I would like to add. I remember before someone asked Frank why he felt the Board of Governors turned down the request for bond issue money. That is one thing I would like to speak about. The Board never gave a reason for it. So if you can find out why they turned us down, I'd be very happy to know. Thank you.

SENATOR HIERING: Thank you, Miss Williams.

Next is Mr. William E. Jeney.

W I L L I A M E. J E N E Y: I sit here under somewhat false colors today because the reason I was invited, I believe, is as a result of the resolution which received general distribution and each member of the Legislature received it. This is from the Alumni Association and we are separated here somewhat now because we are talking of Rutgers College. The reason I am here I suppose under false colors is my term of office expired last

Saturday so I am strictly a "has been", I suppose.

The resolution that we prepared in its own way stems from the incidents that happened in Newark, but in further measure goes back about a year because as an Alumni Association we have been looking into the situation with regard to disadvantaged students and minority students. Now it all came to a head as a result of the incidents in Newark. We had a special sub-committee work on this. They spent many, many hours discussing it and to fill you in somewhat, our Executive Committee, roughly some thirty men, was composed of a broad cross-section of classes. It is not an all white group. A couple of people have accused us of being racists and I felt very badly about that. But we took a great deal of time with it. We took our resolution point by point. But the most important so far as all of us were concerned was that dealing with this admissions policy. We feel very, very strongly that New Jersey is lacking in higher education. And while we don't want to deny any disadvantaged student his opportunity for an education, we felt, one, it was wrong to limit it to the three cities, and further we felt that such a program should be expanded upon immediately and we wanted to awaken not only our roughly 18,000 alumni, but everyone in the State who would have anything to say about it, to get New Jersey's education open to all those who are capable and desirous of the education.

We felt the time was now. We were given this opportunity as a result of what we consider a very unfortunate experience. But the time is now and we presented this not only to our alumni, and they are people who sit here in the Legislature, they are people

who sit on boards of education through the State and in various responsible positions - we wanted everyone possible to know about this, to lend their support to us and as the next few months go by perhaps you gentlemen too will be in a position to make the steps in coordinating and correlating a very meaningful education policy throughout the State of New Jersey. As our resolution stated, we wanted this done in connection with Rutgers, with the various State Colleges, and embodying the network of county colleges throughout the State, and we want someone to take the leadership in developing this type of a program.

That is about all I have. I will entertain any questions you might have.

SENATOR HIERING: Are there any questions?

SENATOR DUMONT: Mr. Jeney, did you go into the question of these transfers of personnel in the admissions office at Newark?

MR. JENEY: Not as individuals. We went into it in this context, realizing what had happened in Newark, we prepared our resolution in five points, as you are aware, and going along with the experience in Newark, we wanted to set up some sort of constructive recommendation for the future so that any misunderstandings would not arise again. This is why we went into point number 5 about protecting the rights of individuals and what have you. I expect that the university will take steps in that direction.

SENATOR DUMONT: That's all. Thank you.

SENATOR HIERING: Thank you, sir.

Mrs. Frank Stamato

M R S. F R A N K S T A M A T O: I will repeat my name again. It is Mrs. Frank Stamato. I am the Director of the League of Women Voters of New Jersey. You may also be interested to know I am a graduate of Douglass College.

Thank you for allowing us to appear rather late today to present our views on the special operational program for admissions at Rutgers.

For more than a decade the League of Women Voters has been engaged in a sustained study of education in New Jersey. During this time, our 10,000 members have arrived at official League positions in several areas.

The League has worked for expanded facilities in public higher education. We have been and are concerned with the kind of facilities as well. We have taken the position that facilities

should be made available in sufficient number and of such diversity as to meet the needs of all who want and can benefit from education beyond high school. In taking the latter position, our members were sensitive to the fact that black and Puerto Rican students in particular, and the poor in general, have traditionally be inadequately served in New Jersey higher education and at present remain underrepresented. Only 3 - 4% of students in our state colleges and university are black or Puerto Rican. We therefore welcome any reasonable attempt at rectifying this situation. We know there are no quick, easy or inexpensive solutions to this major problem, but we believe that encouragement should be given to persons and institutions who are sincerely trying to wrestle with it and are prepared to take a step in the right direction.

We view the Rutgers' proposed program for educationally and economically disadvantaged students as such an effort -- a single remedial step.

Like the Economic Opportunity Fund program, in its first year at all New Jersey public institutions of higher education and a dozen private ones, the Rutgers' program will offer the opportunity to high school graduates from families with incomes under \$6000 (\$7500 if both parents work) to qualify for admission to the Rutgers baccalaureate program. The OEF program is proving to be successful. According to reports from the Department of Higher Education, ninety percent of the 1700 disadvantaged students admitted in September are still in college, in partly remedial -- partly regular college programs, and some of these students are performing exceptionally well.

We urge you to consider the elements of the situation with which Rutgers is attempting to deal. The poor children graduating from high schools in Camden, New Brunswick and Newark have been treated not only to deficient educational opportunity, under-subscribed and under-financed, but have in general been deprived of adequate housing and many of the other necessities and amenities of life which provide motivation and spiritual and mental growth for human beings. The university has now become aware that among these deprived young people are those who could benefit from an opportunity to participate in the university and an attempt is to be made to open the doors, provide a remedial program, and encourage them to work to qualify for a Rutgers degree. Too substantial a number of students graduating from our urban public schools are not capable of meeting the admission standards of Rutgers and most other colleges and universities

The League, has long supported State financial measures to improve and equalize opportunities for public education. I'm sure all of us would like to see the day when there are no young people disadvantaged by an inadequate primary and secondary education. Unfortunately, it is wishful thinking to anticipate this occurring in the very near future. And so for those young people caught in the middle, the alternatives are extremely limited. For some, the horizon may be considerably brightened by an opportunity to prepare for full admission to Rutgers. Hopefully, they can attain a Rutgers diploma and perhaps return to their communities where they may help to rectify those very problems they were given the opportunity to surmount.

We wish to make it quite clear, that we support the Rutgers' proposal as an additional and special program having no effect on regular admissions and standards of admission. The number of openings for New Jersey citizens in our State University is lamentably low as it is -- more than one-half must go elsewhere for higher education. Therefore, we would strongly oppose any diminution of places for qualified New Jersey citizens. It is pertinent to remember that New Jersey ranks 49th among the 50 states in per capita support of higher education and that minimal capital needs through 1975 were reduced by more than one-half before being placed on a referendum last fall. These basic needs had been documented by both the Department of Higher Education and the Governor's Commission to Evaluate the Capital Needs of New Jersey. We believe it is necessary for the state to give greater financial support and to provide for more expanded facilities so that more of our citizens can be served. At the same time, we feel that conscious efforts should be made to extend opportunities to persons who traditionally have not been served. If the state would support this program as it deserves, there would be no question of displacing anyone.

In summary, the League of Women Voters feels that Rutgers is trying to alleviate for a few the results of a deficient environment - of which inadequate primary and secondary education plays all too important a role. This is a situation certainly not of Rutgers' making, but one which the Administration and Board of Governors are voluntarily attempting to correct. The League of Women Voters applauds its attempt to do so. We are fully cognizant of the complex problems involved in such an attempt, and we are equally cognizant of other problems that press on our state so urgently. However, there is little question that the New Jersey state government has been remiss in not giving more help to New Jersey citizens to cope with extraordinary burdens not of their own making. We feel that the Rutgers' proposals may be a good beginning and deserve the moral and financial support of the people and the Legislature of New Jersey. Thank you.

SENATOR HIERING: Are there any questions? [No response.]
Thank you very much.

Next, Dr. Arnold B. Grobman.

D R. A R N O L D B. G R O B M A N: Mr. Chairman, Mrs. Margetts and gentlemen of the panel: I appreciate this opportunity to talk with you about Rutgers College. I am Dean of Rutgers College which is in New Brunswick. This is the oldest of the colleges in the University and the largest. We have some 6500 students as undergraduates, about 3000 graduates, and a faculty of close to 500. So I am the servant of a community of about 10,000 people.

The first thing I would like to do is associate myself with the statement I just heard of the League of Women Voters which I found to be a very fine statement.

Second, I would like to say I am not going to take your time now to tell you about our financial needs. I think that Rutgers College is not getting its fair share of the bond issue money. I think Rutgers College is not getting a fair share of the university budget. I think we need twice as much as we have. But I won't burden you with those things now.

What I should like to do and which might be more interesting to the Committee is talk to you about unrest on campus - and we haven't had any occupation of buildings at Rutgers College - and I would like to talk with you about why there is some unrest, what are some of the causes, who are the youngsters who are involved, and how we have handled specific situations. I thought that might be of some interest to the Committee.

I suppose the first thing to point out is that there are 2400 colleges in America and I don't suppose there has been serious disruption in more than 30 or 40. Another thing to keep in mind I would suggest is that there are 6.7 million students in American universities and the figure is something like .4 of 1 per cent who get involved in some of these problems.

The reasons students get involved - and the simplest thing I can do, I suspect, is to ask just one or two of you to recall back a generation ago. The students at that time were just like today, uninterested in being drafted, but they knew what the war was about. They knew the Nazis were overrunning Europe and

our own freedom was in danger. They knew that we had been attacked at Pearl Harbor. And the students understood what that war was about. Students find it a little more difficult to understand the situation in Vietnam as do many of the rest of us, of course. Those were the days of a very serious depression and most students in school were concerned about going to school so they could find a career. They were going to become teachers or lawyers or doctors or CPA's. They were working hard and the motivation was very intent. In an affluent society the motivation isn't quite as strong for many of our youngsters. So there is another important difference.

I don't need to mention to you the deterioration of our environment with the stream pollution and the unpleasant situations. I can remember as a youngster in Newark going for a drive on a Sunday afternoon with the family up to the Orange Mountains. Nobody takes a drive today on a Sunday afternoon. No one drives anywhere unless you have to get somewhere. You don't drive for pleasure. Our roads are clogged. We build wonderful highways and wonderful automobiles, but there is no place to use them. We build the best airplanes in the world, but they circle over airports for hours before you can land. Conditions in America are deteriorating in many ways and the students feel this.

Well, these are some of the things, I think, that are causing unrest on campuses all over the country. And by and large most of the unrest seems to center in the campuses near urban areas where there are some very bright youngsters: Harvard, Columbia, Berkeley, Wayne, Wisconsin and so on. Some others,

but mostly these are the activities of some very bright and disturbed young people. They look to the campuses for a place to study some of these things that they see deteriorating in our society and they find the campuses not too responsive. The youngsters say they are not relevant. When I went to school, we used to say the courses weren't practical. I think it is the same thing.

O.K. Now let me say a word or two, and I am doing this very rapidly because I know it is very late, about the kind of young men who are involved in the disruptions. I think there are four kinds. There is one group of boys whom I would call reformers. These are young men who see these conditions in our society and in the university and who would like to see the campus changed. They would like to see the university become more relevant, teach things that are more related to urban problems and so on. They push very hard to have change made.

There is a second group of youngsters whom I would call revolutionaries. These are young men perhaps of two kinds; some motivated by the same desires as the reformers and some with political goals of turning over our present society. In any event, they decide that things are so terrible on our campuses, so terrible in our society, that the only thing that can be done is to destroy the society. And if you ask them, "What would you have in its place," they are not sure. They just know things are so terrible it has to be destroyed.

The third group of disenchanted young men - I guess I would call them "copouts." These are kids who are so discouraged with things as they see them, with affluence and poverty hand in

hand in America, our environment and so on, our political problems, that they just give up. They go to class more or less, get passing grades, don't participate in activities and they just kind of drop out of things. They can be aroused though by any other group that starts an activity on campus.

The fourth group of these young men who are disenchanting, I call the black "isolites." These are young men from inner-city ghetto areas who come to a predominantly white campus and have not only all of the other problems that all the other students have, but in addition they are coming into a virtually strange culture. It is hard for us to realize what a difficult change that is. I know I have never experienced it. The closest I have come is a couple of years ago I was giving some lectures in Japan and my colleague took me on a subway and as I looked up and down the crowded subway cars, I could see I was the only non-Japanese on the subway car. And it suddenly gives you a very strange feeling. I imagined all those people were rather hostile. But as a matter of fact I realized shortly they were reading their newspapers or talking to their neighbors or tired or going to work and they didn't care about me at all. But I can imagine the same feeling of hostility in a young black boy, uncomfortable enough coming onto a white campus and being forced to live in a dormitory with many white students, some who aren't very sensitive, some who are, and I can imagine a very severe cultural shock.

These are the four groups, I think, that are in the forefront of dissident activities on our campuses. They comprise collectively, I suppose, two or three or four per cent of our

students. Ninety-five per cent of our young men go to class, study, go to dances, shoot a little pool, go to the movies and do things normal young men do. But we have the small core and they are represented on most of the important campuses in America.

Now the third thing I would like to do is describe for you briefly, if I may, several incidents that happened on the Rutgers College campus, how they were handled, and there were some things that were instructive to me and you may find some of them interesting also.

About a year and a half ago, some of the students I would call revolutionaries, members of the SDS, decided to prevent the ROTC officers from going into their building. The officers occupy a little frame building where they get their mail and keep a few books, but they teach classes elsewhere. The SDS youngsters after several false starts because the military outsmarted them and got there earlier - after several false starts they got on the porch one cold November night, slept overnight and blocked the entrance to the building. The officers went about their business and attended classes as usual. Several students gathered around, maybe 20 or 30 students, and taunted the boys on the porch and there were some taunts back and forth, good-natured jibing and so on. It probably would have played itself out. Someone thought this was newsworthy and called a television network and a sound truck came with photographers and pretty soon the group of maybe 30 or so students on each side swelled to 500 students, blocked the street almost necessitating calling the police to clear the street and

obviously leading up to a major riot. And when the television people left, it simmered back down to about 30 students kidding each other along.

One of the important messages there is that the news media, I am afraid, sometimes make news as well as report it. You look at the New York Times and it seems every day one or two pages are reserved for reporting on student unrest except on Saturdays and Sundays and the space is filled up regardless of the ups and downs of things across the country. The exciting things of occupying buildings make news, but the 2350 other colleges that continue normally are not newsworthy at all.

The students were brought before a Judicial Board. We have at Rutgers College a Judicial Board consisting of two faculty members, two students and the Dean of Students to hear all discipline cases. The students and the faculty have accepted this procedure for handling disciplinary cases. We have had this for four or five years. This is a device incidentally that Columbia and Harvard are just now coming to. We were fortunate to have had this on our campus. The students I am talking about who blocked the building came to the Judicial Board. There was no question of their doing something wrong. They were found guilty. The question was not of guilt but what punishment. Suspension or expulsion is the traditional kind of punishment for things of this sort. But the Board felt that an educational institution should be able to train these young men to take their proper place in society. So instead of suspending them, they were put on probation and given the sentence of attending a

special seminar on the role of reason, rebellion and responsibility in a university community. The seminar was addressed by the Dean of the Law School, by a Professor of English who talked about other incidents in English and American literature, a Professor of History, a Professor of Sociology and so on. About ten students successfully completed this extra program and are still in school or have since graduated and about ten didn't and were suspended. That was one example of one of the disruptions we had.

The second disruption I would like to tell you about was I think in the spring of last year when Dow Chemical Company came to recruit on our campus. Dow is a favorite target, as you know, for students all over the country as is ROTC. I am not sure why Dow because practically every American industry contributes one way or another to the war effort by building tanks or even making uniforms for that matter. But Dow is the student target. The students said they were planning to disrupt the Dow recruiting but if they had an opportunity to debate with the Dow officials, they would refrain from any overt acts. Our Dean of Students, whom you will hear in a few moments, called up the Dow officers and asked, would they be willing to have a debate with the students. They said they would under certain conditions that the moderator be a faculty member and that one other faculty member participate in the debate on their side. So the debate came off and when the students asked the Dow official questions about morality of American industry in the war effort, he refused to answer. He said that was too "iffy" a question and things like that. The

faculty member from another campus talked about the wonderful job that Prudential Insurance Company was doing in building housing for poor people in Newark and the students felt cheated. But nevertheless they kept up with their promise and they did not disrupt the recruiting.

I have learned another lesson there and, that is, that students often times have very legitimate grievances which older people pass off as not very important or give short shrift to. I think the students were cheated.

The third event we had was more serious. It occurred between February 28 and March 4 of this spring. The black students had been making a series of demands. Incidentally, I have learned not to be concerned with the word "demand." I translate it mentally into "request" or "grievances" and it doesn't bother me quite as much. They made a series of demands and they had done this a year ago and we frankly had done very little to answer their requests. They were quite legitimate. They pointed out that the population of New Jersey is 11 per cent black, but 1.9 per cent of the students in Rutgers were black. We had a faculty, a full-time faculty, of 325. Of that 325, 4 were black and of those, three of them were hired during the last year. So they felt there ought to be more black faces around. They would feel more comfortable and so on. You are familiar with these kinds of demands. One thing I didn't mention, earlier in the year in anticipation of these kinds of situations, we had established a Community Action Committee of three faculty members and three students, all elected, the three students elected by the student body and the three faculty

members elected by the faculty. This Committee was to advise me in case of any potential disruption. The idea of the Committee was that it would be representative of the total community of the students and faculty.

This Committee came to me and said, "There is a great danger we are going to have some problems here. We would recommend that classes be cancelled and students be given an opportunity to discuss the serious matters that are concerning them." The Student Council the same evening voted unanimously for the same recommendation. I am sorry, eleven to one. The Black Students were in favor of the same thing. Well, instead of cancelling classes for a week, we cancelled classes for three days, a Friday, a Monday and a Tuesday, with the proviso that the students would organize a series of seminars, work shops, assemblies and various other things to talk through some of these problems and come up with recommendations. They did. I frankly had expected many of the students to enjoy a big weekend and leave town. But the first assembly had 3,000 faculty members and students present with very intensive discussions on all kinds of things, curriculum, financial aid, housing and so on. The result was a series of resolutions passed by the faculty, many of which we are now in the process of implementing, and I think the morale on campus is tremendously improved.

I don't think that we have promoted instant brotherhood among all people, but I think we have engendered a good deal more understanding of each other's problems, a good deal of working together and a tremendous improvement on the campus itself.

The final thing I wanted to tell you about is that this Community Action Committee has been meeting all year. It was charged also with the responsibility of preparing a statement on dissent, a kind of policy for us, and it presented its policy last week. The faculty adopted it on June 3rd. We haven't yet circulated it for the rest of the university, but I have copies here for you so you can see the kind of policy that we have come up with in Rutgers College on the matter of disruption and dissent.

I would be glad to answer any questions.

SENATOR HIERING: You mentioned these three incidents and in the first one concerning the ROTC and the blocking of the building you indicated a hearing was held and these people were not suspended or discharged from school, but they were put on probation. Now in connection with the Conklin Hall matter was a hearing held at that time for those who took over the building?

DR. GROBMAN: I am sorry, Senator. I am not familiar with it. I know nothing more about Newark than I read in the papers.

SENATOR HIERING: In other words, what you are talking to us about is Rutgers College in New Brunswick?

DR. GROBMAN: That's right.

SENATOR HIERING: Any questions?

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: Dr. Grobman, have you been brought in on the master-planning by Rutgers?

DR. GROBMAN: Yes, on both the two plans you have been discussing; I have contributed to the Chancellor's plan and so

have members of my faculty, and I have contributed also to the Rutgers University Master Plan for the university - both of those.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: What about the urban university plan?

DR. GROBMAN: Well, Rutgers College has itself established a program - you have heard it referred to as the transitional year program. We did that about two weeks before the university came out with the urban university program and Dr. McCormick, one of my colleagues, will talk to you about that.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: Did you make any inquiry as to other people coming from the Camden campus or the Douglass campus or the Newark campus to help in the over-all master plan or the urban study?

DR. GROBMAN: I am not sure I understand.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: From what I gathered earlier today from the people that talked from Newark, nobody had been asked what their thoughts were on the Newark campus as to the over-all master plan Rutgers was putting out nor on this new urban program.

DR. GROBMAN: On the master plan, we have been involved on that.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: Only from Queens campus?

DR. GROBMAN: I don't know about the others; I can only talk to what I have done. As far as the urban university program, this program for disadvantaged students, that was announced by the Board and came from the Board as I understand it. So I knew about it no sooner or no later than anybody else.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: Have you studied it since then?

DR. GROBMAN: Yes.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: Did they ask you for recommendations or suggestions?

DR. GROBMAN: As I mentioned, we already had our own plan that we preferred, our transitional year plan, and it will incorporate the urban university program. It is the same kind of students.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: Do you think any suggestions could be offered by the faculty from Camden or the faculty at Newark or the faculty at Douglass? Do you think the Queens campus should decide everything?

DR. GROBMAN: Oh, I see the drift of your question. No, of course not.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: I think two heads are better than one.

DR. GROBMAN: As a matter of fact, none of these programs will go unless the faculties, themselves, are involved. The administration can simply make these suggestions about plans, but the actual work will have to be done by the faculties and faculties will be deeply involved in all of these plans.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: When do you think they are going to start working on it?

DR. GROBMAN: In my college we have been working for a long time. We have had plans for disadvantaged students for about five years now and this is just an extension and an expansion of what we are doing.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: But it isn't within your province to make sure there is the same type of planning at Newark or at

Camden or at Douglass?

DR. GROBMAN: Not at my level, no.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: What level would that come from?

DR. GROBMAN: I think that would be at the President's level.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: Have you made a recommendation though that it be put out on the other campuses as well?

DR. GROBMAN: No. We have recommended what we would like to do in our college.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: And forget the others?

DR. GROBMAN: No, no. I mean, I don't have that responsibility.

SENATOR HIERING: Doctor, you say you have had a plan for five years for disadvantaged students. How many disadvantaged students do you have now in your college approximately?

DR. GROBMAN: I think we have somewhere around 40 to 80. Dr. McCormick has better figures than I do, but it is in that general ball park.

SENATOR HIERING: Anything else?

SENATOR DUMONT: The revolutionaries you mentioned, Dean, you say 3 or 4 per cent, and I am sure that is right, not more than that, consists of all these four groups you mentioned. How many out of that 3 per cent approximately would they be?

DR. GROBMAN: Well, the real active ones are a very small handful. I have heard an estimate here this afternoon of about 75 members in SDS. I think it is closer to about 30. And sometimes when they really want to get something going, they may

not be able to get 5 or 10 people out. So it is a very small group.

SENATOR DUMONT: So the SDS would not solely consist of revolutionaries or anarchists, would it?

DR. GROBMAN: No. I suppose they have a good deal of heterogeneity among themselves too. The general thrust would be in that direction.

SENATOR DUMONT: How long have you had an SDS chapter on campus? I know it goes back at least four years. I just wondered beyond that.

DR. GROBMAN: I don't know.

SENATOR DUMONT: Have you made any decision as to what you are going to do about continuance of ROTC at Rutgers?

DR. GROBMAN: Yes, we have had a very long faculty debate and discussion on ROTC and we have made several important decisions I think, and I think they will stick with us for a while now. Number one, we have decided that the ROTC should become a regular instructional department in the college and not be floating off as a service unit. So, therefore, all the courses have to be reviewed by the faculty and all the faculty members, namely, the officers, have to have their credentials reviewed by our faculty just as any other faculty member has. Number two, we would give college credit only for courses of substance and not for drill. Number three, courses that were not of a military nature, such as History and Political Science, would be taught in those departments and not by the ROTC officers. And, number four, we were going to keep ROTC on campus.

SENATOR DUMONT: It is on a voluntary basis.

DR. GROBMAN: It's on a voluntary basis.

SENATOR DUMONT: Thank you.

SENATOR HIERING: Thank you very much, Doctor.

Next, John R. Martin. You may proceed, Mr. Martin.

J O H N R. M A R T I N: I have no prepared statement to make. I will introduce myself. I have the interim coordinating responsible for the urban university program. I think several questions have been deferred to me. I would rather stand ready to answer your questions than make a presentation.

SENATOR HIERING: Perhaps we could start by asking you what you have done to date? In other words, where does the program stand? How far have you progressed?

MR. MARTIN: Please understand. Let me preface it by reviewing the time table. The policy was articulated on the 14th of March. I was assigned to the project to do all those things and find all those people, both within the university and outside, who could help us make it an operational reality and a responsible program by the opening of five undergraduate colleges in September. We took our time deliberately, not answering any publicity or not putting out any publicity until we had had an opportunity to check with a wide variety of people, beginning with students on all of the campuses, talking with some high school students, talking with some guidance people in each of the three cities, talking with persons around the country who had done programs somewhat similar to this, talking with members, certainly not all, but talking with representative members of the faculties of the five colleges, talking with administrators and so forth.

It struck me, it struck the President and the Provost of the university, Dr. Richard Slater, as extremely important that whatever first statements we made by way of programmatic clarification were things that we could back up when the program became a reality.

While this program is not one intended primarily or exclusively for any particular racial or ethnic group, and indeed the applications that we are receiving to date bear that out, so do the publicity efforts and recruiting efforts that we have made to date, it is certainly true at least so far as black students or potential students in the university who are black are concerned that too many rugs have been pulled out from under such young people already in life, at least in my view. It is important and we felt it was important that the university not in the way of clarification state anything too early that it couldn't fulfill. Thus we began our active answering and clarifying somewhere around the beginning of May after we had had a chance for some considerable discussion as I described.

I might add that even though we had that lag in official publicity, even though we didn't start our own active process of clarification and publication of some details, etc., quite a startling number of well-qualified persons, college guidance persons with backgrounds at the secondary level as well as at the college level, educational psychology, faculty members from other colleges and universities, quite an array of remedial or developmental educational personnel, began to write in and call in to an extent that frankly my office was not geared and

I must say still is not adequately geared to handle, but we have made as orderly a response as possible.

So we have had almost from the start and even prior to our active publicity efforts persons coming to us, kind of reading between the lines the kinds of interpretation that the program was given in the press and so forth, quite interested in being a part of it.

We at the same time have had conversations with some people aimed at finding persons to head the program in each of the three cities. The organizational pattern that we plan to follow in the program will be one that essentially parallels the relative decentralization pattern of the university. That is to say, in Newark we will have a coordinator of the program to be called the Chairman, in New Brunswick similarly and in Camden. The selection of that Chairman or the review of candidates for the chairmanship is being conducted by advisory committees comprised of faculty, students and administrators in the three cities. In Camden we have already named a Chairman, Dr. Rodney Carlyle, who I believe for the last four or five years has been on the faculty of the Department of History. He is at a point now with extensive conversations with me and with others, with his faculty, with his advisory committee, ready to hire staff and money that has recently been made available, as was mentioned earlier, is really what he needs at this point to begin the actual business of bringing people on.

I am hopeful both in New Brunswick and in Newark before the end of the week, I wouldn't want to be held to that, but it is highly important that we have the top man on, and I do

expect that within the next five to seven days we will be able to name the persons who will be in charge both in New Brunswick and in Newark. I know today two interviews were scheduled that had to be cancelled so that the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences in Newark and the Assistant Dean, both of whom have testified, could be down here at this hearing. I know also that those two interviews have been rescheduled for, I believe, Wednesday of this week.

I was in conversation last night about 10:30 with a prime candidate for the chairmanship in New Brunswick who is from some distance away.

So far as spreading the word is concerned, we have met with the guidance personnel, the principal board of education personnel in each of the three cities. We have had opportunity at some leisure go over all of the major and minor questions about the program to invite and to get from each of those groups of persons a rather broad statement of cooperation which has been followed through on. We have placed in their hands for distribution to all of the guidance personnel in their charge applications for the urban university program in their cities.

We are just beginning to get applications in now. I would say Statewide we have received somewhere around a hundred the last time I checked which was a day or two ago. Breaking it down, I would say about 30 or 35 in Camden, about 10 or 15 in New Brunswick, and the balance in Newark. I expect that to pick up. I can't make any prediction as to how many applications will finally be generated without engaging in any outrageous business or flamboyance or what not. We are certainly taking

every step to actively portray the program as one that might be of interest to students who live in those cities and that it is a responsible program and one that we will have operational in September.

SENATOR HIERING: But you actually haven't been able to start what you might call your serious recruiting as yet?

MR. MARTIN: You mean recruiting of students?

SENATOR HIERING: Yes.

MR. MARTIN: Well, I would say we have, sir. It is still picking up. I can truly say in a rather compressed time period such as we are working in, a day or indeed a week means a great deal. A great deal can change when you are going from zero in March to the operational stage and portraying it as a responsible, well-executed program a few months later. We have to move across so many fronts. We have, as I would imagine most admissions offices now have, some out-reach personnel, some recruiters, who all during the year are out primarily in the schools, making contact with guidance personnel, etc. To the extent that they are available at this time of year, given the other "in the office" responsibilities they have, they are pressed into the effort.

Now in Camden they have a community advisory committee which was formed by Mr. Jim Ritz I guess six or eight months or so ago. They have a talent search program that predates the enunciation of the Board of Governors' policy. What is being done down there is utilizing the personnel, the resources of the talent search operation plus the admissions office operation to plug into the recruiting for the urban university program.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: I have a number of questions. Every time I asked a question in this hearing earlier, everybody said, "Wait until Mr. Martin comes on." So I'm afraid I have saved a few for you. Mr. Martin, I gather from your testimony you have had about a hundred so far?

MR. MARTIN: Roughly a hundred or so.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: And how many of those are black?

MR. MARTIN: I don't know.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: You have no way of identifying them?

MR. MARTIN: No. At this point no interviews have taken place. I really don't know.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: And you expect eventually 800? That's the figure I have heard.

MR. MARTIN: Yes, at one point that was a planning figure. I think we had planned in those terms simply because when you are talking about a totally, self-contained, add-on budget, you have to stop at some point and tote up cost. As I said, I have no way of knowing whether we will arrive at September 15th with 800, with 500, with 300.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: How many personnel have been hired to work on this program?

MR. MARTIN: To date comparatively few. We are genuinely set to go and this week we will be hiring personnel probably in all three cities.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: It seems to me and I know studies at the Harvard School of Education and at Teachers' College at Columbia have made the point that this is a very difficult problem reaching the ghetto youngster, which is, I assume, the youngster we are generally talking about, and that it takes highly trained

personnel. Do you expect to get such highly-trained personnel starting now for this fall?

MR. MARTIN: Well, yes. To go back to my comment earlier, I have been rather gratified. We have about 350 resumes at this point and literally a staggering number of these people calling up every week and asking, "Are you close to being ready to hire people?" I have talked personally, even though I knew two weeks or three weeks ago we weren't ready to hire, with between 30 and 40 such people. I think there has been kind of a preselection here along really high-quality lines. Going back to what I said about publicity, perhaps by our own deliberate choice that we didn't want to speak too early, we allowed ourselves to have our policy and our program interpreted and indeed formulated publicly for us in some cases. So reading between the lines, some people nonetheless were able to see that something not only quite sincere, but some thinking had gone into this and it was a major State University staking out a position to really press forward on a very important front. Yes, I feel that we will be able to get the number of people we need. I think we could hire tomorrow a considerable number, I wouldn't estimate the percentage, of those we will need by September. But I think they are there. Plus I would add that this kind of program, while it is a major step forward in terms of scale and what not, can be plotted on a continuum, as Dean Grobman pointed out. With respect to each one of our colleges, there has been some pre-existing efforts and there has been a number of personnel of considerable talent and sensitivity in each one of our colleges who have been bending

themselves to a considerable extent to make these things work, regular faculty people, administrators, persons in the several Deans of Students offices, etc. We are not starting totally from scratch in terms of willingness to bend to the effort, knowledgeability, and so forth.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: How many faculty members approximately do you plan to hire to deal with this program?

MR. MARTIN: I would say probably as a rough rule of thumb about one professional personnel of some type, and that goes across the lines of psychologist, counsellor, teacher, teacher-counsellor, about one professional person for every ten students.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: Will these faculty members be full-fledged members of the university, members of the Faculty Senate, with full faculty privileges?

MR. MARTIN: The persons who are engaged in disciplines to augment the academic departments of each one of the colleges will be members of their departments and thus members of the faculty. Where we engage a teacher-counsellor, a counsellor or a psychologist, etc., they, such as I, and Deans and so forth are not by virtue of non-teaching responsibilities normally members of the faculty and so they wouldn't be either.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: I am talking now about teaching personnel who would teach, but who would not necessarily fit into a department. A remedial reading instructor would certainly be very valuable to your program.

MR. MARTIN: I can't make a flat statement on that. Now one person whom we are anxious to attract to the program is

currently on the faculty of a far western university. In the sense that the nature of his work puts him on the faculty there, I happen to know also that those are the qualifications for faculty membership in the Department of Education of our university. On the other hand, some persons who are practitioners who may be working under him, tutoring in the reading, while at the same time performing counselling functions in a teacher-counsellor or tutor-counsellor kind of capacity, probably will not be scholars in a discipline but rather professional practitioners and would not be members of the faculty.

SENATOR HIERING: Anything else?

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: Mr. Martin, how many members of the faculty in Newark, Douglass and Camden have you consulted with regarding the over-all makeup of this program?

MR. MARTIN: Taken together?

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: No. I'd like to know, have you seen many people from the Newark campus and asked them for their thoughts, ideas and suggestions?

MR. MARTIN: I would say it was shortly after, only several days after, the circulation of the policy that I was up in Newark and spent several hours talking with a predominantly faculty group that comprises the Admissions and Scholastic Standing Committee. I thought we had a very fruitful, certainly a very thorough and rather extended discussion of what had been done in the Newark College of Arts and Sciences in the past, where they thought that this kind of policy might go. And subsequently - I'd say three or four weeks later - I got a six- or seven-page memorandum from members of the Committee,

signed in the name of the Committee, that was most constructive in planning. That doesn't describe that properly. There were about 18 persons in that meeting. I believe the report was prepared by three or four for the Committee. Even that 18 though does not encompass the whole of the faculty with whom I have talked informally. In terms of great formal committees and things of that sort, I confess that there hasn't been that. But there has been I think a pretty wide - I won't say a totally representative - but certainly a wide sampling of opinion on an informal basis and I have received perhaps a hundred different unsolicited commentaries, two- or three- or four-page papers from faculty members throughout the university.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: You felt you had the same representation from Camden too?

MR. MARTIN: Oh, yes, very definitely.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: And Douglass?

MR. MARTIN: Yes. I pause because the New Brunswick situation hasn't lent itself as much to even such committee gatherings as we have had in both Newark and Camden. Camden has the oldest of the three urban university advisory committees. It was the first one formed and they have had more meetings now than I can remember. But a similar process is under way, but so far as getting opinions from persons at Douglass as well as Livingston College and Rutgers College, they have been forthcoming and as Dean Grobman said and Dr. McCormick will say, we have had discussions over the last month or so with Rutgers College on integrating the effort of the Rutgers College pre-existing program, the transitional-year program, with the emerging

urban university program in New Brunswick.

SENATOR DUMONT: What are you using for money when you hire these professional people? The money that the Board of Trustees already voted, the half million dollars?

MR. MARTIN: That is the only money, Senator, that I know of at the moment.

SENATOR DUMONT: That's available?

MR. MARTIN: Yes.

SENATOR DUMONT: Have you made any special efforts to inform and advise the student body, the present student body, and the alumni about this program, the new admissions policy?

MR. MARTIN: Yes. I believe that all of the several printed documents that we have circulated to all of the faculty on all of the campuses have also been especially directed to the student press plus, as I say, we have had continuing conversations with a variety of students and student leaders on the several campuses.

SENATOR DUMONT: Have you had any meetings or convocations with the alumni association and their representatives?

MR. MARTIN: I haven't. I know that both the President and I believe - I may be in error - I know the President has met with bodies of alumni on several occasions. I believe too that Mr. George Holston, our Director of Public Relations, has on several occasions sent mailing pieces, perhaps the same ones that I have sent to you, to the alumni. The alumni magazine also has done a story or perhaps two on the program. I think the first interview that I gave to any publication was with the Rutgers Alumni monthly magazine.

SENATOR HIERING: Anything further? [No response.]

Thank you, Mr. Martin.

Next, Dean Howard J. Crosby.

DEAN CROSBY: Mr. Chairman, because of the lateness of the hour, I would like to yield to Dean Foster so some statement may be made of the Douglass situation.

SENATOR HIERING: All right then, Mrs. Foster.

D E A N M A R G E R Y S O M E R S F O S T E R:

Contrary to the situation of several people who are here, I did have a prepared statement which I am also prepared to leave with you, not to read to you. I have thought up several other things, some of which summarize what was on that statement and others which comment on what has gone on here since.

I am awfully glad to have a chance to speak and I do appreciate Mr. Crosby's generosity in making this possible if it was not to have been.

Our major interest obviously in coming here today was to try to say what to a large extent Dean Grobman said, and that is, a college can forward equity and quality without major disruption. And before I amplify that statement at all, perhaps I should explain to you in case you don't know it - I won't do it at any length - but we have a thing called the Federated Plan in New Brunswick. There is Rutgers College, there is Douglass College and Livingston College that is about to open in the fall - these three undergraduate colleges each have their own faculties, members of whom constitute the graduate faculty. Rutgers University entails these three colleges, the graduate faculty, many profession schools, the College at Newark and the College

at Camden. This is why Dean Grobman spoke for Rutgers College which impinges on the graduate faculty. I speak for Douglass College which also involves some members of the graduate faculty.

We do have at Douglass College, and I shall mail to you, a statement of our policy on disruption. We have a Committee on Disruption made up of faculty members and students who will deal with any trouble should we have it, which I don't really expect, but one never can be certain. We also have a Committee on Dissent, which has been set up to accept suggestions from members of the community and hopefully in predicting difficulty, avoid it.

It is true, I think, as Dean Grobman so effectively said, the press has given a fair amount of coverage to Camden and Newark because they are more exciting in what has happened. Douglass and Rutgers are not pleased that what has not happened at Douglass and Rutgers has not come so forcefully to your attention or that of Mr. Dungan. This does suggest perhaps that the militants are correct, that it is necessary to take over a building in order to come to the attention of the higher authorities. If this proves to be the case, it is rather a sad lesson that some people will have learned and I hope it doesn't prove to be the case.

You should know what has happened and what didn't happen in New Brunswick as well as what happened and didn't happen in Camden and Newark.

At Douglass we called off classes for three days. There is a certain similarity in what happened between Douglass and

Rutgers. We had meetings, large meetings and small meetings. We set up six committees to study various aspects - this was in March of this year - various aspects of the black problem, admissions, scholarship, curriculum, appointments of personnel, special lectures, counselling. Those six committees, made up of black students, white students, faculty members, administrative officers, met and at the same time those small committees were meeting we had a series of workshops organized in a large part by the students. Miss Sue Bernstein who is here worked for the Government Association and Miss Karen Predow was a representative in this group of the Black Students Congress. Almost the entire student body and the faculty were there. The students assured that the faculty be there when they heard that classes were called off by getting on the telephone on the weekend and calling all the faculty members and that took quite a bit of doing, but under Miss Bernstein's able leadership, they were all contacted.

The meetings were successful. There was understanding came out of them which certainly was not there before. We learned each other's language. Again Dean Grobman has explained to you, I think, some of the difficulties, many of which you are aware, of communication between a student who comes from a ghetto area and is plunked down in the midst of what had been a predominantly white college. In these meetings we had students, faculty members, trustees and alumni members. We were seeking solutions by peaceful means and we believe it is really a failure of education if solutions can't be arrived at by reasonable means. If we can't get that idea across to students as a way of operating,

then there is something very wrong, we believe, with our system. It does take, however, a willingness on both sides not only to listen and express opinions but occasionally to admit that we don't always win and this is a point of view which not everybody has quite come to yet, but many of us who have been around a while realize that one doesn't always win. Many of our students have come to this realization. Nonetheless, all should have an opportunity to have their opinions expressed and considered carefully.

With these committees taking the leadership, we have made some real progress on the campus and I would like you to understand the way the committees work. They came making demands, as again has been explained, but the demands turned into recommendations and the recommendations were backed by the committees as a whole. People who had not seen the point before these discussions took place came to back the recommendations. The students came to us not just saying, "You ought to do this." They came saying, "We have researched this question and we have some ideas how you may do it." For example, when we said we can't find qualified black faculty members, they came to us having written to most of the graduate schools in the country asking for the names of qualified black faculty members who might be interested in coming. We have managed to appoint at least one and possibly two people from this list and the contacts developed through this have been profitable to us.

Secondly, when it came to a black studies program, we had been studying and planning to put in such a program and had

sundry ideas, but we weren't moving as fast as they thought desirable and even as we thought desirable, but we thought we were moving as fast as we could. Again they wrote to the universities in the country which had black studies programs and they presented to us a curriculum - suggestions of how these things could be done. In other words, they weren't just saying, "You ought to be doing it." They were willing to help. The same thing was true on admissions.

I should like to emphasize that in our working with these students, there have been none of them who have suggested a lessening of standards. They don't want their degrees minimized any more than anybody else's. They don't want badly prepared professors teaching them or anybody else. And when we discussed these standards with them, they understood what it is we were talking about.

Secondly, there is no one I know of on the Douglass campus that wants separation on the basis of race. We have instituted a Black Studies house similar to a French house or a Russian house. It will be open to anybody who is interested in our Black Studies program, both white students and black students, and this is the way everybody seems to want it.

The major difficulty that we have in instituting the recommendations, and these recommendations have been adopted by our faculty in formal meeting, is once more the question of money. We can find students who are very good risks to enter our programs, but what with Federal cuts and other financial difficulties, we have had to turn away students who right now would like to come to Douglass because in most cases they just

plain don't have the money and neither can we do anything to help them get it. You in the Legislature have done a great deal on this. We can only plead with you that a great deal remains to be done and we hope very much that you will help us with it.

Douglass has, I believe, - I have been there only two years - this is the end of my second year - I think it has the oldest of the programs to go out searching. We had teams of faculty members and students and admissions officers going out searching around the State for disadvantaged students. I think we have percentagewise the largest number. Our Freshman class entering last year was 7 and 1/2 per cent black students, specially admitted students, not all black but mostly black. We could do better if we had the wherewithal.

There are a couple of other general points that I feel constrained to mention if you will give me another couple of minutes.

First, now that Dean Crosby has been so gentlemanly, I hesitate to say there are conceivably other types of discrimination than racial and sometimes Douglass suffers from the same difficulty that even Rutgers suffers from, thinking that we are mistaken for a girls' finishing school, which we are not. We may finish some people but not in the way they intended. We are an integral part of the university, one of the five colleges, one of the three federated colleges, and we do expect and need the same type of support that the other colleges need. If we by any chance don't get it, I don't know what we'll do - we will go around saying we have been discriminated against and that

wouldn't be nice. It is notable, I think, that in Queens, a place we are all very fond of, there is only one woman administrator and she is black. She is helping another cause than that of blacks.

Since Douglass has taken the lead, as I have explained, in searching out disadvantaged students, we cannot be accused, I think, of snobism, either intellectual or social. But I should like to say one word for the concept of a resident college. And let me hasten to say that the resident college program in this State as now conceived is without cost to the State. You all know probably that our dining and dormitory facilities are self-supporting. Now I don't think this is right. I think you all ought to be contributing something to it because the cost is going up beyond the means of too many people. However, at the minute, it doesn't cost you a nickel to support the residence and the dining programs.

There are many reasons for a resident program, I think, and I can't obviously go into an essay on that. The first and most important one is that it makes possible centralization of scarce resources and rare facilities which you can't afford to have in every part of the State. It has already been mentioned that it aids students to get away from home. One of our difficulties is that even though they come to us, they go home weekends where they have to take care of little Johnny and do the wash and listen to mother's raving and ranting about why did you go to that place anyway. So they get away from home not only to get away from home, but to have a different experience.

At a resident college one is enabled to have - I was about to say a 24-hour education, but our girls do sleep some of the time. You can spend more of your time on the educational process both inside the classroom and outside the classroom in lectures and discussions during dining. This really does intensify the educational experience and I think greatly improves it.

The four-year sequence - we have talked about transfers and I won't go into that - but there is a great deal to be said for four years that are part of a consistent program planned from the beginning. If you transfer, and many people will and we want transfers, you start over again. The curricula aren't necessarily and shouldn't be entirely coordinated. You don't know who the good teachers are or the bad teachers are and they are always some of both. You have to start making your friends over again. You have to start finding out where to get your hair cut. All that sort of thing takes time. But basically it is the academic program which is planned from the Freshman year on and which is planned pretty much as a unit and if you transfer in the middle, this is interrupted and you lose time. Now plenty of people get along all right with this, but it is not an efficient system so I would suggest that we not lose sight of the advantage of a consistently-planned four-year program.

I would also say that although we agree to a large extent with the efforts not to have absolutely homogeneous student bodies, you all know I think that Rutgers and Douglass and probably Livingston and to some extent Camden and Newark have been forced to be selective by scarcity of facilities.

Now there is a great deal to be said, and I don't need to go on about it, about the desirability of a certain amount of selectivity to give some degree of homogeneity to the intellectual ability of the students. We believe in variety of experience and variety of people with whom students associate, but I also think, although there is by no means unanimity in our faculty on this, that a class -- I teach Economics. I know that I don't want people in the class who just are blank to teach for one reason or another. I think the class moves faster and gets farther if you have people of somewhat comparable abilities, tested in various ways. This doesn't necessarily mean high College Board scores, but people whom we have determined by one means or another can take what we are giving. We need an able group to stimulate each other in this out-of-classroom effort, to stimulate the faculty. Our faculty teaches both at the undergraduate level and at the graduate level. They are specialists. The specialists are able to do a better job with the able student, to interest him in going on or her in being a teacher himself or herself.

So to sum up, Douglass has grown. It has gained from its experience in the last year, in the experience of helping meet the needs of the black students. We hope we are going to grow in size too because we can do a better job if we are permitted to do that. This takes a little bit out of your bond issue money. We can do a considerably better job if the Legislature, as I am sure it will, will continue to support us for I don't need to say to you that the State is going to be no better than the State University and the State University is going to be no

greater than the sum of its various parts.

I will be very happy to answer any questions that you may have.

[The written statement submitted by Dean Foster can be found on page 154 A of this transcript.]

SENATOR HIERING: Any questions?

SENATOR DUMONT: How many disadvantaged children are allocated to Douglass in numbers, that is?

MRS. FOSTER: We admitted last year 57 black students, about two-thirds of whom were disadvantaged. We had 115 black students last year. You did notice, I think, that our numbers have been increasing. Three years ago, we admitted 19 on a special program. The next year it was 39 and last year it was 57 and we expect to have a proportionate increase - I don't know how many we can afford to support - for this year. We have 65 already. This means that we have a disproportionate number in the lower classes.

SENATOR DUMONT: Thank you.

SENATOR HIERING: Thank you very much.

Dean Howard Crosby.

D E A N H O W A R D J. C R O S B Y: Mr. Chairman, I will be very brief in that I would only like to tell you or to emphasize that one of the techniques we have found so far successful in communicating with students and attempting to handle disruption before it comes out has been the device of having a student-faculty committee whom we could call right to the scene even. Whenever we have anticipated during the past year the possibility of any type of tensions, we have been able to

deal first with a student regulations committee, which was a student-faculty committee, and since the establishment in November of the Community Action Committee, that group has been on the scene.

It seems to me that in part the existence of student members of the Rutgers College committees as full voting members for about the past two years since the college was re-established and the fact that the faculty voted its meetings open to the students and to the public as well at a meeting also, I believe, in November has helped maintained the communication and hopefully if we are able to retain this, we will be able, one, to respond firmly but flexibly to the various causes and grievances that are presented to us and yet also respond firmly and with due process to any violations of university regulations or ordinary law on our campus.

I will be happy to answer any questions if you have any you would like to ask.

SENATOR HIERING: Dean, you mentioned this student-faculty committee which you have at New Brunswick. Do you know if they have that type of committee in Newark?

DEAN CROSBY: I do not know. Dean Foster just mentioned that they have a similar committee at Douglass. In fact, they have two of them. We combined functions in one. But I don't know about Newark and Camden.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: Do you ever have a meeting of the Deans of students of Newark, Camden, Douglass and yourself?

DEAN CROSBY: Yes, we do.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: Do you ever discuss what you are doing?

DEAN CROSBY: Yes, we do.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: But you don't know whether they are following suit or not?

DEAN CROSBY: This is right. Each college works out its procedures to meet its own special needs. And I could not tell you. Dean McGuire is here and I am certain would be happy to answer the question of whether they have a similar committee at Newark. I don't honestly know.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: You all seem to operate independently. I don't know why you have three separate or four separate universities. You all do what you want to by yourselves and there is no coordination.

DEAN CROSBY: Well, let me try and make that clear. There are basic principles of operation which are established by the university procedures. But within those basic outlines of procedure, each college sets its own policies and operations and ours, for example, are set by the faculty of Rutgers College. The policy on dissent which was furnished you was voted by the faculty. The committee was voted by the faculty. I don't know that the Newark faculty have voted a similar committee. There would be nothing requiring them to do so. If they didn't have it, Dean McGuire would have other channels by which he could consult faculty and students. He might choose official representatives of the student government to assist him in that role.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: Do you feel through this dissent group on the Queens campus this year you have been able to forestall any serious problems?

DEAN CROSBY: I think they have been of invaluable help to us in forestalling serious problems.

SENATOR HIERING: Is that all? Thank you, Dean.

Next is Dr. Richard P. McCormick.

D R. R I C H A R D P. M C C O R M I C K: Senator Hiering and Mrs. Margetts: I don't have to remind you all that it is getting very, very late in the day and this tends to produce a kind of weariness on all our parts. But I think it may also produce a kind of reflectiveness. At least, it has that effect on me. And as I have reflected on what I have been hearing here today, I have been asking the question: Basically what is it that has brought us together here? What are we trying to get at?

I suppose on one level you could say we are here because a group of frustrated students occupied Conklin Hall or you might say that we are here because the Board of Governors promulgated what has been mistakenly called a policy of open admissions. But I think you must recognize the fact that we are here because there were riots in Newark in July of 1967 that expressed something about the concerns in our society. We are here because a little more than a year ago Martin Luther King was assassinated. We are here because those events and so many other events that I could enumerate but don't have to in your presence have made us very keenly aware of the problems of racism and poverty in our society. And we are here, I think, because we share a common concern in trying to figure out how higher education in New Jersey can best recognize these

problems of racism and poverty in our society and how higher education in New Jersey can best address itself to these problems. And, of course, basic in that concern is our deep conviction that it is one of the basic elements of the American dream that there must be genuine equal opportunity for all and this includes equal educational opportunity.

Now I am going to be very blunt. Down until very, very few years ago, Rutgers University, the State University of New Jersey, was in every way but the way that would be invalidated statistically a lily-white institution. We graduated our first Negro in 1892. In the course of the next 50 years, there were 22 other Negro graduates. The situation improved statistically during the 1940's and '50's and '60's. We were graduating perhaps in the 1950's something in the order of maybe 5 Negroes a year. And as has already been pointed out, we had on our faculty one black scholar as recently as two years ago. We were very late in becoming concerned about this problem. We were not unique, however, in the tardiness with which we addressed ourselves to the problem. This is a function of the whole of our society.

But in 1963 for certain local reasons we did become concerned in New Brunswick about the lily-white character of Rutgers. And it occurred to many of us that we were not really meeting our obligations as a State university. We were not meeting our obligations as a humane institution, that something must be done about it. So there was organized an Equal Opportunities Council and out of that developed in 1965 what we considered for that time at least an aggressive program to bring more black

students to Rutgers. This evolved into what has been called our 15 high schools program, where we had members of our faculty and recruiting officers working with disadvantaged youngsters in 15 high schools of the State, and for a while we regarded that program as a success and in terms of what other institutions were doing, I suppose we should have regarded it as a success because it did result in a significant increase in the number of black students at Rutgers. But as recently as last September even after these intensive, as we regarded them, intensive efforts, we admitted only 42 black students to the Freshman class in Rutgers College. A considerable proportion of those students were what we call "high risk" students; that is to say, students who would not have been admitted had the conventional criteria for admission been applied.

That program was not a great success in terms of numbers. But it was a success in that it demonstrated to us that those "high risk" students turned out to be good risks and that the dropout rate of those students was not significantly different from the dropout rate of the so-called regularly-admitted, fully-qualified students.

In May of 1968 following the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, the black students at Rutgers took that opportunity to make it clear to us that what we thought were aggressive programs were totally inadequate programs, and most of us agreed with them. So there began a movement within the faculty to study ways and means of increasing opportunities for disadvantaged students in New Jersey. Then in late February developed the events that Dean Grobman has mentioned to you.

I had the privilege of serving as the chairman of a special faculty-student committee that was appointed to respond to the demands or recommendations of the black students at that time. Fortunately when my committee met, we had present in the same building with us members of the administration, the chairmen and members of several faculty committees who had been working on this matter and essentially what happened was that the events of late February and early March accelerated our approach to this problem. Recognizing that our existing procedures were not producing results, we developed what we are now calling our transitional year program. We hope by next September to enroll 100 disadvantaged students in that program, black and white. This will be a combination remedial program and regular college program.

We believe that the only way, first of all, that Rutgers can have a significant number of black students is through such a special program. But even more fervently do we believe that Rutgers must have more black students, more disadvantaged students generally, if it is to fulfill its responsibilities as a State university. And I would most cordially ask for your understanding and support in accomplishing what we regard as a very desirable educational goal and beyond that, an essential social goal.

We are very proud, as I think you may have detected, of what has been done at Rutgers College this year. Because my wife happens to be a member of the faculty at Douglass College, I bask in the reflected pride of that college as well. We think we have acted responsibly and intelligently in addressing

ourselves to this problem. We cannot begin to solve it, however, within the bounds of Rutgers University. We need your assistance. We need the sympathy and understanding of the Legislature. Beyond that, of course, we need the sympathy and understanding of the good people of New Jersey and I think if they appreciate the relevance of what happened at Conklin Hall, to, let us say, the Newark riots, to the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, to the commitment that we have to provide genuine equal opportunity for all, equity along with justice, I think that this program of which we are so proud should make you proud and ultimately, I would hope, the people of New Jersey.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: I would like to comment that you have given us a very good and forceful historical exposition that befits the State's leading historian.

A couple of questions. Your remarks were primarily if not completely devoted to Rutgers College and the programs as developed there.

DR. MC CORMICK: Right.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: And I am certainly impressed with those programs. What bothers me a little bit, if you care to comment, is you at Rutgers College were certainly moving forcefully in the right direction. There is no question, as we have heard from Dr. Pine and others, they were doing a good job getting started in this area. At Douglass, they were working in this area. At many of the State Colleges, I am sure, they were working in the same area. The Legislature passed the

Educational Opportunity Fund to assist the whole program along. What bothers me a little bit, more than a little bit, is coordination of these programs. Something seems to be lacking from the over-all picture. Somehow we should I think, and I thought this was the function of the Department of Higher Education, be able to say, "All right. We have a problem of the disadvantaged in New Jersey. Rutgers is taking this bite out of the situation. The State Colleges are taking this bite. The community colleges are taking this bite." I just don't see it happening. I don't know if you are the one to ask that question or if you would like to comment on it. Are you disturbed also by that?

DR. MC CORMICK: I would be glad to comment on it, Mr. Kean. Rutgers is a group of colleges. Rutgers does consist of a group of faculties and there is reserved to each of those faculties a degree of autonomy in formulating educational programs. We see decided advantages in this, so that each college is not, so to speak, a stamped-out copy of every other. Each college, I think fulfills special functions. On the other hand, there is coordination. Let me speak, for example, about the relationship of what I will call our Rutgers College program to the urban university program, about which we have heard a good deal today. Let me say, first of all, we thought we were bold in 1963 in setting up that Council of Economic Opportunity which resulted in a modest advance. We thought, those of us in the Rutgers College faculty, that we were bold in March of this year when we projected an increase of 100 black students. I can only commend the Board of Governors for going far beyond

what we did in boldness, in vision, in setting forth what I think is a great challenge to the other educational institutions of the State. We are engaged in the closest kind of cooperation between the Rutgers College program and what we call now the UUP program. I have had long conferences with John Martin and others of us have. And the way we see it at the present time, Mr. Kean, without becoming bogged down in details - what we project is this: The remedial phase of the work that we foresee in our transitional year program will be done within the urban university department in New Brunswick. There will not be a duplication of activity. Our program, in other words, which preceded the Board of Governors' program by approximately two weeks, can readily be geared in. It will be geared in. We have had conversations in that direction and as a matter of fact a number of us are meeting at 9:15 tomorrow morning to hammer out some of the final details of that cooperation. I think it is going to be a beautiful program.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: Would the transitional be in addition to the urban?

DR. MC CORMICK: Yes. If I may say just a word on that, we can anticipate a fair number, let us say, of Urban University students at Newark and at Camden. We cannot anticipate large numbers in New Brunswick because of the relatively small pool on which we would have to draw, essentially one community. Consequently there is going to be differing numbers of students and we feel that in terms of the situation at New Brunswick, in terms of the facilities that the colleges in New Brunswick have to offer, that we can make our largest contribution

probably at Rutgers College and comparable activities underway at Douglass College, in terms of numbers, at least, through the programs that we have already indicated. But, as I have suggested, they will not be in conflict with but complementary to the plans that are well developed for the Urban University Department in New Brunswick.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: They will be boarders, these transitional-year students?

DR. MC CORMICH: The transitional-year students will be residential students. We regard this as an experimental program and among other things we are going to be interested in finding out to what degree students who have a residential program will perform better than students who do not have a residential program. As a matter of fact, we are in contact with certain agencies in Washington now trying to get funds to make a really firm study of this question, of whether disadvantaged students of this type can be expected to succeed as well in a commuting situation where they remain in their home environment or whether in fact they will not do much better if they can be placed in a residential environment.

SENATOR DUMONT: Dr. McCormick, it seems to me, aside from selling this program to us - and I believe that we are all interested in trying to help people throughout this State, particularly those who are disadvantaged - you are going to have to do more to sell it to your own student body and to the alumni of Rutgers.

DR. MC CORMICK: I agree.

SENATOR DUMONT: In listening to the three young people

here today, two of them had almost diametrically opposite viewpoints on the support of the program, the first two. So I am assuming that Miss Williams who edits the newspaper is sort of in the middle here, expressing an unbiased viewpoint and she says she thinks a majority of the student body is opposed until at least they become better informed. Then I think you have to do the same thing with your alumni body. Because after all they are spread out through all this State, the students and the alumni, and they are our constituents and they can do a great deal to help sell the program, aside from what the faculty and the administration have been trying to do for it.

DR. MC CORMICK: I take that very much to heart and as a challenge, Senator.

SENATOR HIERING: Thank you, Doctor.

Would Dean W. Layton Hall come up, please. Dean, I didn't know whether you wanted to make a statement. I think we may have a couple of questions for you.

D E A N W. L A Y T O N H A L L: Well, I indicated to you that I had no formal statement. I think it would be a tragedy for a man who has worked 19 years in his post in Camden not to at least indicate that this university certainly does do a good deal of coordinating of effort. To indicate that we never talk to one another would be tragic and have you go away with that kind of an impression.

Furthermore, I would say that my college in Camden, to which I went in 1950, has drawn heavily on other parts of the university. I think furthermore we have drawn on the experience

of the other colleges. The Douglass people were really, I think, quite out in front in the whole matter of going out to recruit in the 15 high schools program and we have tried to follow that program. We are later in getting it done. We, I think learned, just as all the rest of the colleges learned, that we did far too little for the people who are in our immediate city because of the immense competition for spaces in our college. We had many, many students. We tried to pick them by reliable admissions procedures. We still, however, in a college with about 1,000 students had fewer than 20 black students and I suppose not more than one or two Porto Rican students.

So we have gone about the whole task of increasing that and I think it is interesting also - I couldn't help noting the fact if you want to look at numbers, we had 3 black faculty members at a time when we only had about 65 faculty, which means percentagewise ours was better. We will have next fall 6 black faculty members out of about 80, probably 7 black faculty members out of about 80 and we are still seeking more.

The very briefest of summaries though - truly Rutgers University is a large and complex organism and the evaluating team who came from the Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools to our college just a year ago to do a visitation commented on the fact that it was a large and complex organism and they wondered to some extent how it worked as smoothly as it did, but admitted that it did work. I think that would be the statement I would like to make. I would be very happy to answer any questions.

SENATOR HIERING: You heard Dean Grobman testify from New Brunswick and he indicated at the college there that they had a student-faculty committee which would pretty much make a determination as to punishment for violations, as to whether it should be suspension or expulsion or probation, what it might be. Do you have any such setup at Camden?

DEAN HALL: We do indeed. This comes under the Department of Student Life in which Dean Millet works, but we have a faculty-student relations committee which is made up of both faculty and students and these people meet continuously whether there is any agenda or not to simply leave the door open. Furthermore, throughout the entire winter Dean Millet and various faculty members, and I joined them occasionally, meet in the college center every single week and have a coffee hour where we invite people to come, anybody who has a problem of any sort, to tell us about it. Furthermore, in a student body of 1,000, I see a good many of those people just as I walk about the campus each day. In other words, my college does not have several thousand students. We have just 1,000 and it has reached just a little over 1,000 this year. So I have taken it from 200 in 1950 to about 1,000 this year and I still know a good many of those people and in like manner the faculty sees the student body every single day going back and forth and I think has a pretty close relationship with them.

SENATOR HIERING: Who serves on the student-faculty committee?

DEAN HALL: Members of the faculty who are appointed by the Dean, the Dean of Students works on it and another member of

his staff, and then the number of students has been increased to an equal number, so that we have representatives who are chosen actually by Student Council who serve on that committee.

SENATOR HIERING: Now if you have, for instance, a severe violation of one of your rules or regulations, does this committee actually have a hearing and listen to both sides of the problem and make a decision?

DEAN HALL: This committee that we have is essentially working on positive matters, essentially concerned with solution of problems as they arise. But from that committee also is a dissent or a disruption committee. There is actually a disruption committee which functioned when we had our college center occupied for a few hours. That committee is made up, as was described in the green report which was issued by Chancellor Dungan, - I think you will find that in the report there - the dissent committee includes the Dean of Students, it includes the chairman of the faculty-student relations committee and it also includes the president of the Student Council. And those three people are charged with the responsibility of dealing with a problem of disruption.

SENATOR HIERING: Now at the time we had the problem when the college center building was occupied, did this committee consider that problem and consider whether there should be probation or suspension for those people who were involved?

DEAN HALL: That committee worked all night to get our building vacated and the committee did not take up the matter thereafter.

SENATOR HIERING: Well, why didn't they take up the matter? Wasn't it their duty to consider whether there should be punishment or not? Did they make a determination they didn't want to take it up?

DEAN HALL: It was not considered essential to continue the thing further. What we did do was to move into a three-day period of very profitable work together. Now these people have indicated that there have been sessions on the other campuses in which all of the students and the faculty were gathered together to discuss all of the problems which have been raised by the 24 demands which were presented to us and we felt that that was by far a more positive way to go about this thing and it proved, I think, in the long run to be exactly that. In other words, out of that experience has grown a very positive thing and we have found that the 24 demands, most of them, were quite reasonable when thoroughly understood. I think we have made a great deal of progress without any harm done, without a lot of difficulty with individuals. We certainly had no reason to want to lose what few black students we had. We felt they did have grievances with their number so small and it seemed far more profitable to deal with the thing positively in these meetings and those have, of course, been followed up in various forms of action. We have already begun a black studies program and the urban studies program. These two things particularly were recommended and work is going forward on those. In addition, many of the things that were in the 24 demands we felt were already well under way and were already being initiated.

SENATOR HIERING: In connection with that occupation, was there any damage done to your college?

DEAN HALL: No, sir, not a bit.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: Dean Hall, at any time were you or any of your staff down there consulted on the Rutgers' Master Plan?

DEAN HALL: We have an opportunity to contribute to every plan. As far as a present master plan, something that is coming out in print tomorrow or something of this kind, I am not aware of this. We are consulted in all planning. We have a continuous planning process for our own campus. We have not only a Planning and Policy Committee for the college, itself, but the campus which includes not only our college, which is undergraduate, but the Law School and School of Education, also has a Campus Planning Committee which is concerned primarily with physical planning and concern for buildings. So we are in a continuous planning situation as far as our campus is concerned and in one sense, since we are 60 miles distant, it makes an awful lot of sense for us to work on that plan.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: But I mean the over-all planning coming out of Rutgers, out of Queens campus, out of the main headquarters. Do you send representatives up there or do they come down and discuss the master plan with you or the urban university plan with you?

DEAN HALL: In so far as I know, long-range planning for the entire university goes on continuously, and each of the colleges does its very best to make its plans for its own future and to be concerned about how rapidly it should grow, hopefully how

much it can do with the facilities that are placed at its disposal as well as looking forward to the whole matter of trying to acquire still more facilities.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: You are not asked though. ---

DEAN HALL: I think what you want to ask me is whether or not we have been drawn into a specific plan which is now to be released within a few days.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: Correct.

DEAN HALL: And I think the answer to that is no, not that I know of.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: And what about the urban university plan, have you been brought into that personally?

DEAN HALL: Not prior to its announcement.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: In other words, a great deal of stuff is coming out of the Queens campus with none of the other campuses really knowing it is going to appear until it suddenly shows up there.

DEAN HALL: Well, the Rutgers Urban University Program did come out completely from the Board of Governors in response to a very real need, I might say.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: Oh, definitely. I think it is a good idea.

DEAN HALL: So do I.

ASSEMBLYMAN EWING: But I think other people, such as yourself and members of your staff, as well as Douglass and Newark, could add something to it. I just can't see in today's testimony where anybody has been really consulted on either the Rutgers' Master Plan or this Urban University Plan.

DEAN HALL: We are encouraged to send all of our comments regarding any of these. The Chancellor's plan, for example, was circulated and we were all encouraged to make any comments we wanted on this plan. It would certainly seem to me that all of those comments have been drawn together. I would suspect that they have indeed. So that our faculty and our administrative people have all made contributions to that so far as our college is concerned.

SENATOR DUMONT: Dean, you have, according to this statement, 21 full-time Negro students. Is that correct?

DEAN HALL: I guess it is somewhat fewer than that right now, right this instant, but it is about 20. I think at the moment, it may be 17.

SENATOR DUMONT: This shows no increase over the previous college year of 1967-68. Does it run about the same?

DEAN HALL: That's just about right. We admitted a very small group of people this fall. This was the first year in which we admitted people under the 15 High Schools Plan and it was a mixed group, by the way. It was inter-racial, partly black, partly Porto Rican and partly white.

SENATOR DUMONT: What is the percentage of blacks to whites in the City of Camden; do you know offhand?

DEAN HALL: I am not positive. It has been estimated that it may be higher than 45 per cent black.

SENATOR DUMONT: Thank you.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: A brief question - I gather from what you say you haven't seen the master plan that is coming out tomorrow or the next day or whenever it comes out.

DEAN HALL: No, I haven't.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: To the best of your knowledge has anybody at Camden seen that plan?

DEAN HALL: I don't think so.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: And yet this is the plan for your future, right?

DEAN HALL: I wouldn't know until I see it.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: I presume that if this is going to be a master plan for the future of Rutgers University, you as an integral part thereof are contained somewhere in that plan.

DEAN HALL: I would surely hope so and expect to be there.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: But I would feel much happier had you been able to assure us you were there.

DEAN HALL: It is quite conceivable when we see the thing, we may find our own handiwork included in it. That is the point I tried to make to you in my testimony. In other words, it seems to me quite likely the planning which we have done will appear when this plan appears. We didn't get a chance to read the proof, but nevertheless it seems to me entirely possible that our planning will be shown in this plan once it comes out.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: But I think you might have seen it prior to the time it was published in the press in North Jersey last week.

SENATOR HIERING: Anything further? [No response.]
Thank you very much, Dean Hall.

Dr. Henry Winkler.

D R. H E N R Y W I N K L E R: I will just take a moment. I am Vice Provost of the University and Dean of the Faculty of Liberal Arts.

In answer to Mr. Ewing's question and Mr. Kean's question, every one of the Deans in the university, in all 19 units of the university, was asked to submit a statement of the present status of his college or unit of the university and a statement which indicated what his plans were for the future. This was formally requested of the Deans at a meeting of the Provost Cabinet. Those statements were actually sent into the Provost. The Provost staff worked on them, put them together into an interim report and that interim report which you have seen represents the thinking of the Deans, in many cases, the Deans with their faculties. So I think it would be erroneous indeed to leave the impression that Queens developed a plan and that none of this came from other units of the university.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN. Though I haven't seen it and I don't think any member of the Committee has, don't you think it would be appropriate to have shown the Deans their thinking prior to it becoming public knowledge?

DR. WINKLER: As a matter of fact, the Provost did circulate the interim report to the various administrative officers of the university, the report which you may remember was used as the basis for his testimony before the State Board of Higher Education within the past week.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: But this master plan - is that what

you were talking about, the master plan?

DR. WINKLER: I am talking about the interim master plan.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: This was circulated to Newark and to Camden?

DR. WINKLER: I don't know if all the Deans have seen it. I do know that a number of the Deans have seen it.

ASSEMBLYMAN KEAN: Do you know any Dean at Newark or at Camden that has seen it?

DR. WINKLER: I haven't the slightest idea. But I do not want the impression to be left with this Committee that any of the units of the university did not participate in the making of that plan because it would be an erroneous impression.

SENATOR DUMONT: Vice Provost and Assistant Provost - who is over whom?

DR. WINKLER: I don't think anybody is over "whom." We have different functions.

SENATOR DUMONT: You all work together. How many Provosts are there?

DR. WINKLER: There is one Provost. There are three Assistant Provosts. There is one Vice Provost.

SENATOR DUMONT: And you are all at New Brunswick or are you spread out?

DR. WINKLER: No, we are all at New Brunswick.

SENATOR DUMONT: Thank you.

SENATOR HIERING: I think we have taken care of everyone that we have on the list. I may have missed someone, I don't know. Is there anyone else who would like to be heard who has

not had the opportunity?

E D W A R D C. M C G U I R E: My name is McGuire. I am Dean of Students at Rutgers in Newark and I was directed by one of my students to come down and clarify one or two things that apparently are on the mind of the Committee.

The first thing I was asked to clarify was to assure you that there is a Faculty-Student Committee constantly at work concerning itself with the life of the students at Rutgers in Newark. The Committee meets frequently. There is a fairly equal number of faculty members and students, chaired by a faculty member. Students are appointed by the graduate school and by the Student Council and meet every other week.

Secondly, in so far as some of the concerns about acts of violence on the campus in Newark, I think I have to make it very clear after the testimony of one of the students that the acts of violence really were not in my opinion very serious acts. The first is when two female students allegedly were assaulted by a non-student on our campus. With the active support and direction of our security personnel, the two students filed a complaint against this non-student. The complaint was heard in one of the courts in the City of Newark and the charge was dismissed.

The teacher that was assaulted got involved in a door-pushing contest with a student. At that time one was coming and the other was going after a very emotional faculty meeting. The faculty member came to my office and spoke to me. I had the student in. There was conflicting testimony. I offered both

the opportunity to appear before a Faculty-Student Conduct Board, at which time they could iron out their difficulties and the student, if guilty, would receive an appropriate penalty. The faculty member decided that he did not want to do this. The student decided in the interest of good fellowship on our campus to write him a letter of apology even though he said that perhaps the door was swinging the wrong way and he should --- [Laughter] So these are the acts of violence which were alluded to by one of our students who is in his third year at Law School. Other than that, gentlemen, unless you have any specific questions, I really have no further statements to make.

SENATOR HIERING: Dean, did the Student-Faculty Committee actually consider whether those who took over Conklin Hall should be punished or not? Did they make this determination?

DR. MC GUIRE: Yes, they did.

SENATIR HIERING: In other words, they met and considered it.

DR. MC GUIRE: They met. They considered. They listened to the black organization of students and anyone else who would like to appear before them and give testimony. No one but the black students appeared. I can say with good honesty before the black students appeared, there was some very strong feeling to take some very definitive action against the organization. After the black students appeared, their leadership as well as many of their followers, the Committee decided that they did not want to take what might be considered an ultimate act, namely,

dismissal from the university, but did indeed, and unfortunately this has never appeared in the press, but did indeed censure the organization for their acts and further indicated to them that in the future, though they be members of an organization, if they as members of an organization participate in an act of criminality on the campus, that acts will be taken against them on an individual basis and not on an organizational basis. They were censured and in my opinion censure is a very serious weapon to be used against a student or a student group. A letter was sent to the President and carbon copies to the Executive Committee to this effect.

SENATOR DUMONT: By the "organization," you mean the Black Panthers?

DR. MC GUIRE: No, sir. I mean the black organization of students which is a student organization on the campus.

SENATOR DUMONT: Were they the only ones involved in this occupation of the building?

DR. MC GUIRE: That's correct, sir.

SENATOR DUMONT: Was the SDS involved in any way?

DR. MC GUIRE: The SDS were involved outside the building with picket signs indicating they were supporting the demands of the black students who were currently on the inside of the building. The SDS were never inside the building at any time. It is generally a misnomer to assume that SDS and BOS are on agreement in everything. As a matter of fact, they are miles apart on many, many things.

SENATOR DUMONT: Thank you.

SENATOR HIERING: For the record, I believe it should be pointed out that the leaders of the BOS were invited to be here today to testify if they wished, but none of them apparently desired to appear.

Are there any further questions? [No response.] Thank you, Dean.

Does anyone else wish to be heard or are you all getting too hungry?

We will conclude the hearing. Thank you very much.

[Hearing Adjourned]

Statement by Margery Somers Foster, Dean
of Douglass College of Rutgers University
June 9, 1969

Douglass College is here today to demonstrate that it is possible to move the State University forward and to make its policies more equitable and at the same time to act in a responsible manner and still uphold our cherished traditions and high standards. We could have predicted that when discussions concerning the needs of Black students occurred late last February and early March the periodical press and other media would devote attention almost exclusively to the situation in Newark and Camden--since that was where the more dramatic copy was--but we were not pleased that in the Chancellor's report to the Legislature, and in subsequent public discussion by legislators, little if anything was said about what occurred in New Brunswick. This suggests that militant students may be correct when they say that it is necessary to take over a building to get public attention to their needs. We at Douglass believe that what happened at our college also needs the attention and interest of the Legislature. We believe that, on the whole, our college acted rationally, responsibly, and creatively during and since the disturbances, and we think that you should know about it.

It is too early to know yet whether what has taken place at Douglass during the past few months has permanently improved the social and educational climate of the college, but it is my conviction that it has. The present atmosphere at the college is characterized by a new seriousness of purpose and mutual respect between the various elements making up the community. This has been brought about by the dialogue involving students (black and white), faculty, administration, alumnae, trustees, and many citizens throughout the state who have

been working with us, confronting and seeking solutions to problems that have too long been plaguing America. We may not find all the solutions. But we must try. This to a large extent is what colleges and universities are for.

Classes were cancelled at Douglass College for three days in late February and early March in order that the entire college community might discuss the needs of Black students. They were not cancelled in response to threat or intimidation. We learned during those days that cancelling classes does not mean closing the college. In fact, involving a college community of over 3000 persons in committee meetings, workshops, debates, and negotiation sessions can be an educational experience for faculty, administration, and black and white students alike--an experience as worthwhile as, no doubt more worthwhile, given the concern of the community at that time, than anything that normally would have taken place in the classroom.

The organization of this work was under the direction of students, including Miss Sue Bernstein for the College Government Association, and Miss Karen Predow of the Douglass Black Students Congress, who are here with me today. In an amazingly efficient fashion they speedily prepared well-researched working papers and organized small and large groups to carry on discussions and plan future action; many of these student-faculty groups proved so worthwhile to the participants that it was only our recent course examination period and commencement that brought the meetings to a close. They will be picked up again in the fall. Meanwhile real advances have been made toward equal opportunity. Where we had said we could not find qualified Black faculty members and staff and students, we now, working

together, have found them. And let me emphasize that no one at Douglass in these discussions wanted lessening of academic and personnel standards, and no one wanted separation of Blacks and whites. At the height of the special activity, and throughout the discussions, Blacks and whites have emphasized maintaining standards and working together. Our major concern now is that, in part because of cuts in Federal funds, we do not have the financial support for scholarships and counselling that is necessary to admit and educate the students we have identified. The Legislature has done much for our students in recent times, but we sorely need additional money to make possible the programs for which we have such a good foundation.

I believe disruption and disorder cannot be justified--certainly not on a college campus--and I have not nor will I condone anything approaching disruption and disorder, of which, fortunately, there was very little at Douglass. But there are a few people who wish to dwell on the cancellation of classes and some minor incidents on our campus as though these have been the only things of significance occurring at Douglass during the past few months. Of far greater significance is the added rapport between Black and white, students and faculty, and faculty and administration as a result of facing common problems together. Much new understanding for the condition and situation of others has come about. We saw this happening as far back as March 3 and 4 when what had originally been styled "demands" by the black students, were changed to "recommendations", and where white students, faculty, and administrators, some of whom had begun with a substantially antagonistic attitude toward Black students' "demands" now found themselves to be strong advocates of many "recommendations" although little in their substance had been changed.

To sum up: we have been doing a good bit of growing at Douglass the past few months--and, as is usually a concomitant of growth, there has been some pain associated with it. But we have the definite sensation that we are moving forward, that we are a better college for what we have experienced, and that our future, if we can count on the kind of support we need from the Legislature, is truly bright.

RUTGERS COLLEGE POLICY CONCERNING DISRUPTION

Adopted by the Rutgers College Faculty
June 3, 1969

An academic community, where people assemble to inquire, to learn, to teach, to reason together, should be protected for those purposes. Whoever obstructs, circumvents or perverts those purposes deserves the censure and the criticism of that community.

BE IT RESOLVED:

1. That the Rutgers College Faculty recognizes that the causes of disruption can be closely related to the total environment of the campus community and that the Faculty reaffirms its commitment to continue the examination and appraisal of its policies as they pertain to the College community.
2. That the Faculty establish the Community Action Committee as a standing committee in the College composed of three faculty and three student members (and one alternate of each group), to be elected on a yearly basis.
3. That the Faculty direct the Community Action Committee to continue and strengthen its investigative functions; to channel community grievances to proper committees for their disposition; and, when necessary, to propose to the Faculty, reforms in the College structure.
4. That normally in cases of potential or actual disruption, the Community Action Committee shall attempt to investigate the situation and advise the Dean before any action is taken. Should the Committee judge the campus situation to be sufficiently serious, it shall request the Dean to call the Faculty into session as expeditiously as possible to deal with the matter.
5. That, should acts of arson, willful destruction or threat to life occur, the Faculty authorizes the administration to treat such acts as criminal acts and dispose of them accordingly.
6. That at no time shall a member of the College community be summarily suspended, expelled, or discharged from the College, nor shall he be so threatened. Due process, as defined in the College Handbook and University Regulations, shall be guaranteed for each individual.
7. That the Faculty recommend to the University administration the adoption of a policy similar to this one.
8. That the Faculty recommend the formation of a committee to determine whether there is a need for a New Brunswick-wide committee similar to the Community Action Committee.



