

FINAL REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

ON

LIVINGSTON COLLEGE

A REPORT BY THE SENATE  
EDUCATION COMMITTEE  
OF THE NEW JERSEY SENATE

January 13, 1976

NJ  
90  
R973  
1976



STEPHEN B. WILEY  
CHAIRMAN

ANTHONY SCARDINO, JR.  
VICE CHAIRMAN

HERBERT J. BUEHLER  
ANNE C. MARTINDELL  
WAYNE DUMONT, JR.

## State of New Jersey

### SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

ROOM 217  
STATE HOUSE, TRENTON, N. J. 08625  
TELEPHONE (609) 292-5526

Governor Brendan T. Byrne

Members of the Legislature

Ladies and Gentlemen:

The Senate Education Committee of the New Jersey Legislature is pleased to present its report on Livingston College of Rutgers - The State University.

After extensive study of Livingston College which included a preliminary report on its history, meetings on the campus with its administration, faculty and students, and discussions of the College at Committee meetings, the Senate Education Committee has prepared a report which takes a broad look at the development of Livingston College and evaluates the success of its educational innovations.

The Committee found that Livingston College has made good progress toward developing a college which utilizes the resources of The State University to study the problems of New Jersey's Urban Communities. It is our hope that this report will help citizens of this State become better acquainted with the goals and achievements of Livingston College.

Respectfully submitted,

Herbert J. Buehler

Wayne Dumont, Jr.

Anne C. Martindell

Anthony Scardino, Jr.  
Vice Chairman

Stephen B. Wiley  
Chairman

MEMBERS OF THE SENATE EDUCATION COMMITTEE

HERBERT J. BUEHLER , 10th District  
Parts of Monmouth and Ocean

WAYNE DUMONT, JR. , 15th District  
Passaic (Part), Sussex and Warren

ANNE C. MARTINDELL , 14th District  
Parts of Mercer, Hunterdon, Morris and Middlesex

ANTHONY SCARDINO, JR., VICE CHAIRMAN , 36th District  
Part of Bergen

STEPHEN B. WILEY, CHAIRMAN , 23rd District  
Part of Morris

---

DAVID TAYLOR, RESEARCH ASSISTANT

## T A B L E O F C O N T E N T S

THE NATURE OF THE STUDY	Page 1
I. INTRODUCTION	3
II. EXPERIMENTAL OUTCOMES -- A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE COLLEGE AND AN EVALUATION OF ITS PROGRESS	6
A. SOCIAL FORCES WHICH AFFECTED THE COLLEGE	7
B. AN EVALUATION OF LIVINGSTON'S EFFORT TO DEVELOP A MULTI-RACIAL COLLEGIATE COMMUNITY	9
C. AN EVALUATION OF LIVINGSTON'S PLAN TO EMPHASIZE INTERDISCIPLINARY STUDY	27
III. THE PRESENT STATUS OF THE COLLEGE	32
IV. CONCLUSION	36
APPENDIX A - REPORTS AND DOCUMENTS UTILIZED IN THE PREPARATION OF THIS REPORT	
APPENDIX B - PROPOSED STUDENT CHAMBER CONSTITUTION	

## The Nature of the Study

In the six years since Livingston College has opened, people in this State have heard mixed reports about its successes and failures. There had never been an overall independent assessment of the College so it was impossible for anyone outside the College to determine the truth of these reports. Members of the Education Committee of the New Jersey Senate were concerned about Livingston College and the alleged problems that have developed during its first few years. The Committee briefly reviewed the history of the College and reports that it had received and decided that it had an obligation to investigate these reports and evaluate the College's progress toward its goals. The Committee requested documents from the College and directed its staff to meet with the Dean, faculty and students to analyze the development of the College and report their preliminary findings to the Committee as a whole.

Following numerous discussions of the College at Committee meetings, the Committee visited the College on October 22, 1975. The visit provided the Committee an opportunity to discuss the general objectives of the College with the administration, the development of the academic program with the department chairmen, and the quality of classroom instruction and student services with the students. This overall process permitted the members of the Committee to become familiar with the unique mission of the College and the numerous difficulties that it had encountered in seeking to realize that goal.

Following their examination of Livingston College, the Committee has released this final report which outlines the history of Livingston, evaluates the success of its educational experiments and summarizes the Committee's conclusions. The Senate Education Committee has tried to present a complete, accurate and objective view of Livingston College. The report is based on information gathered through interviews with the College administration, faculty and students; documents obtained from the University which included, among other things, annual reports by the College to the Board of Governors, reports prepared for internal evaluation by the University, minutes from the faculty chamber, and minutes of the curriculum planning committee; and accounts from New Jersey newspapers.\*

\* A full list of documents obtained and utilized in preparing this report is included in Appendix A.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Livingston College is a new division of Rutgers University. It is a four-year undergraduate college which offers degree programs to 3,488 students in the arts, humanities, social sciences, physical sciences and natural sciences. Located on the site of the former Camp Kilmer in Piscataway, Livingston takes its place next to Rutgers, Douglass and Cook College in New Brunswick, and with them forms a federation of individual colleges which pool their resources to contribute to the University's graduate programs while retaining their own identity and distinctive approach to undergraduate education. From the outset, Livingston College was conceived of as the unit of Rutgers University which would marshal the resources of the academic community to study the problems of our urban communities. Its intention was to develop new teaching methods and create a satisfactory multi-racial learning environment.

Planning for the College began in 1964, at a time when there was a growing national view that traditional approaches to higher education were seriously defective and it was felt that the State University was doing little to solve the racial and urban problems of this State. These deficiencies were carefully examined by the planners of the College and they decided that priorities within the academic community must be shifted and the traditional college curriculum restructured to make the new College relevant to problems facing man in modern society. Although the College would offer a full range of instruction in the arts and sciences, special emphasis would be

placed on teaching intellectual and professional skills that the individual needed to understand and contribute to society. Traditional distinctions between disciplines would be bridged so that the knowledge and methods of many disciplines could be combined to find solutions to today's problems. Much of the curriculum would be problem oriented rather than subject oriented to encourage professors with diverse backgrounds to focus on common problems. Thus, from the cooperative efforts of the urban sociologist, political scientist, economist, city planner and computer scientist, one might expect contributions toward solving the problems of urban blight.

It was felt that the unique mission of Livingston College demanded that special efforts be made to recruit students who ordinarily did not attend other branches of the University. Efforts were made to attract two very different groups of students: those who were bright and well prepared, who were unconventional in idea, in temperament and approach to learning, who were primarily from the middle class and tended to bypass the State University to go to small private colleges; and those who were educationally disadvantaged, who were bright, talented and possessed a desire to learn but who had not been adequately prepared for college, who were primarily Black, Puerto Rican and working class whites who had never enjoyed access to this State's system of higher education. It was hoped that these two groups would be compatible -- some spoke of "cross fertilization" between the groups. The early faculty envisioned a kind of dialectical process where the non-

traditional students would articulate the problems that they faced in urban America and inject insights that they gained through experience and the students with strong academic backgrounds would be challenged to apply their talents and skills to urban problems and both would learn how academic resources may be effectively utilized to solve contemporary problems.

**New Jersey State Library**

**New Jersey State Library**

II. EXPERIMENTAL OUTCOMES --

A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE COLLEGE AND AN EVALUATION OF ITS PROGRESS

Not unlike every other bold experiment in American Education, Livingston College has been surrounded by controversy. Everyone admits that the College has faced serious problems and suffered some setbacks. The question remains, however, as to whether the College is now in a viable position and whether the overall experiment is to be termed a success or failure.

Many of the faculty believe that any attempt to evaluate the College may be premature. While they are as impatient as anyone with the initial problems of the College, they believe that a decade must pass before the outcomes of the experiment are visible. Dr. Amelie Rorty, who participated in the original planning of the College and has remained as a faculty member, expresses concern about the tendency of many to assume that Livingston constitutes one grand experiment which can be termed a success or failure. Such an approach is fallacious, she argues, since there are many experiments at Livingston each of which demands independent evaluation.

While we agree with Dr. Rorty that there are numerous experiments at Livingston that must be assessed individually, we will restrict our analysis to the two major experiments -- the attempt to restructure much of the curriculum by bridging disciplines, removing many of the traditional restraints imposed on the students' course of study and granting students the freedom to investigate and indeed solve contemporary problems; and the attempt to attract the non-traditional student and

assemble a student body which encompasses a much broader spectrum than is found at other colleges.

As in the case of all social enterprises, there were numerous independent variables which intervened and altered the planned outcome. Before examining the important experimental features of the College we will briefly describe the social forces that had an important influence on them.

A. Social Forces Which Affected the College

Livingston College opened in September 1969 in the midst of the most turbulent years on college campuses. The planners, it seems, did not fully anticipate the situation, nor could the College have been fully prepared to confront the problems.

It is generally admitted that it was a mistake to locate a college with such experimental features on a campus that is isolated from the larger University and surrounding community and only partially constructed. Classes began on a campus that was ankle deep in mud and without a gymnasium, playing field, student center or library, far from the nearest snack shop or movies, and with a student body consisting almost entirely of freshmen. The situation was compounded by serious administrative weakness and understandable reluctance on the part of the faculty and administration to impose upon the students what would have been perceived as an arbitrary, repressive judicial mechanism. Consequently, while every campus in the country was experiencing serious drug problems among students and a rapidly-rising crime rate, most colleges had at their disposal greater support services and previously estab-

lished security and disciplinary procedures for dealing with the problems. While Blacks on every campus were isolating themselves from whites and demanding more control over their program, the consequences were greater at Livingston since they had a larger proportion of Black students. That first year was also characterized by nationwide demonstrations against this country's intervention into Cambodia and, as in other branches of the University, Livingston students struck and the semester ended prematurely.

Looking back, some of the faculty feel that it was unfortunate that Livingston had opened at that particular time since the events that the College experienced were overwhelming and beyond its control. These matters seemed to supersede the students' concern for normal curricular matters and the faculty remembers few students who were intent simply on pursuing their course of study.

Certainly every campus was having its share of difficulties but the events at Livingston College appeared to be more confused, and more extreme to people in this State than perhaps they were. Had the same events occurred at a well-established college they would have been perceived differently and had a different effect. These problems of the College undercut the initial optimism among the faculty and students -- some ceased participating in the affairs of the College, others were simply less enthusiastic about the possi-

bilities open to the College. Perhaps the most devastating effect was the derogatory image that became associated with the previously unknown College. As a result, the College temporarily had difficulty recruiting students.

B. An Evaluation of Livingston's Effort to Develop A Multi-Racial Collegiate Community

Experiments in higher education may be infrequent, but they are not unheard of; the University of Chicago, Goddard, Oberlin and Antioch are certainly familiar examples that come to mind. Each of these colleges had a somewhat different view of what constituted the proper academic curriculum and manner of presentation, but they all shared a well-endowed private status and a carefully selected student body. Each college made extensive efforts to seek bright, well-prepared and highly-motivated students who had already demonstrated their ability to do college work.

Livingston's attempt to restructure the college curriculum and develop an interdisciplinary approach to investigating the many problems facing contemporary society was in keeping with the tradition of past experiments. Livingston parted company, however, when the faculty also committed itself unanimously to an all out effort to identify, recruit, and admit a significant fraction of minority and other disadvantaged students to the College. In the Dean's annual report in 1968 it became clear that the College was deeply affected by the riots in Newark and other cities in this State, as well as the recent death of Martin Luther King. In that report Dean Lynton ex-

pressed the College's desire to go beyond recruitment and spoke of its effort to develop a multi-racial collegiate community:

"In turning our attention to this task, we realized that a major challenge accompanying the admission of many black and Puerto Rican students into a hitherto white institution really consists of a confrontation between different cultures. To cope with this properly the burden of the change in adjustment cannot be placed on the minority student, but must be shared by the entire College community. The College must strive not only for a cultural diversification of the curriculum, but also for a total campus atmosphere conducive to the co-existence and to the constructive interaction of groups with widely different backgrounds, each dealing from strength and appreciating the others. All aspects of the College must reflect that our society does not derive its strength and its tradition solely from white and western sources. Our culture is a heterogeneous and pluralistic one, enriched by its very diversity. A college cannot be responsive to the needs of all its students and even less to the needs of all society unless it truly mirrors this diversity as an integral part of its entire educational fabric."

So far, the stress was on culture and on cultural pluralism. In its last words on this big step, the 1968 report starts to move from culture to social interaction:

"To achieve this it is not enough to have a few black faces on the faculty and to introduce a few 'black' courses -- although both of these are essential and we intend to pursue them as strongly as possible. But in addition the white faculty and the white community in general must learn a great deal about those parts of society from which until now we have been almost totally segregated and to whose needs and aspirations we, therefore, are insufficiently responsive. We will work very hard to establish a many-channeled, two-way flow of communication between the ghetto community and Livingston College so as to trigger this learning process and to create the kind of continuous feedback which traditionally and quite automatically exists between a public institution of higher education and the white and middle-class segments of society."

Once the College opened in 1969 we found evidence that the faculty began to realize more clearly that mere admission of disadvantaged students was not sufficient to give them a real opportunity to gain a college education. Indeed, some faculty began to wonder whether the policy of admitting unprepared students without adequate support services might be a greater sin than not admitting them at all. In such a case, they argued, the College would be raising these students' expectations with the promise of a college education only to create greater despair a year or two later when they failed to complete the program successfully. Other divisions of the University could provide only limited assistance to the new College since they had just begun to develop educational and counseling programs for disadvantaged students in response to the establishment of the Educational Opportunity Program by the New Jersey Legislature in 1968. Every college was experimenting with a variety of techniques to correct the educational deficiencies of the newly-recruited students.

In its first year, Livingston organized its own tutorial and advisory system to compensate for the educationally disadvantaged students' lack of academic experience and achievement. These services were soon reorganized and expanded to include courses and laboratories under the then new Academic Foundations Department. The faculty also decided to make basic skills courses available to any student in the College who exhibited deficiencies in reading, writing and mathematics. The College found that many of the regular admissions students were also arriving without skills that are necessary for college work. In order to deal with all students who lacked proficiency in

basic skills an examination was developed by the faculty and administered to all incoming freshmen. All Livingston freshmen were required to take this examination and if their score fell below a predetermined level they were required to take courses in the deficient area.

The intensification of the College's commitment to the non-traditional and minority student did not alter its intention to seek many unusually well prepared, bright and self-directed students. None of the College's early reports adequately addressed the implications of accepting such a diverse mixture of students. Such a dual commitment would ultimately require the College to develop two different admissions procedures and programs which were suited to students with great differences in their cultural background and level of preparation for college work. This attempt to deal with the two very different groups of students simultaneously later caused many problems for the College. While it was socially desirable, it was bound to create misunderstandings and antagonisms on the campus and elicit fears and rumors in the surrounding community.

Statistics that we obtained from the University indicate that Livingston College initially succeeded in attracting the diverse mix of students that it sought. As of August 1969, Livingston had received replies from 627 freshmen who planned to attend. From that number 496 were classified as "regular admissions" and the remaining 131 fell into the "high potential" category. The data included in that report showed a clear break between the two groups. Eighty-five percent of the 496 "regular

admissions" freshmen were white. Statistics for this group were not as high as some had hoped, nonetheless they were unquestionably well qualified -- they had average Scholastic Aptitude Test scores of 530 and the average student in this category fell within the top quarter of their high school class. The 131 freshmen with "high potential" had among them as few whites as the "regular admissions" had non-whites. Their average SAT scores fell below 400; their average rank in their high school class was just under the half-way mark. On the average we find between the two sets of freshmen a gap of up to 150 in their SAT scores and a quarter of their high school class.

After the first year, Livingston began to have difficulty recruiting qualified students. Applications to the College did not increase at the anticipated rate and by 1971 it simply did not have enough applicants to be selective. At the low point in 1973, the Admissions Committee disregarded the admissions criteria and admitted 87% of those who applied. This recruitment problem was at least partially a result of news accounts of the College which convinced many that Livingston was not a place for serious study. After reading such stories many parents refused to allow their children to apply to a college which they believed had serious drug, crime and racial problems. Improvements at the College and a university-wide effort to inform potential students of the many good aspects of the College has significantly improved the recruitment effort. A new admissions procedure has also increased the quality of the applicant pool and encouraged students to apply to Livingston when they apply to other branches of the University. In 1974

applications increased by 27% as compared to a 16% increase for the entire University. Similar increases this year make Livingston's recruitment efforts comparable with other colleges in the University.

Enrollment statistics also indicate that Livingston was never able to draw upon the kind of highly qualified applicant pool of minority students that was available to Rutgers and Douglass. This can be attributed to the vigorous competition to recruit minority students by colleges in the late 1960's and Livingston's lack of aid for high achieving students. Since there are no scholarship funds at the College the financial aid program depends totally on EOF funds which place a low priority on high achievers. The EOF guidelines from the Department of Higher Education explicitly exclude well-qualified students from the program. Academic eligibility is specified in this way:

"The EOF program is aimed primarily at students who are both economically and academically disadvantaged; it is not a scholarship program for bright minority students. Each institution should determine what its EOF admissions criteria are within the broad context of State guidelines. The first priority is for students who satisfy the criteria of economic and educational disadvantage. High achievers may be recruited only after the primary criteria have been satisfied and all other means of financial aid have been exhausted."

The criteria makes it difficult for Livingston to maintain its significant commitment to minority students since it restricts 90% of the EOF Funds to the educationally disadvantaged. The problem is magnified by the University's present interpretation of a student's disadvantaged status relative to the statistics

of the regular admissions students at each individual college. The statistics for Livingston's Regular Admissions Students have traditionally been lower than other colleges due to their commitment to non-traditional students and the practice of admitting larger numbers of such students. Consequently, at Livingston, a student must have lower SAT scores and fall lower in his graduating class to qualify for the EOF program. While most of the minority students that attend Livingston are capable of doing college level work, there are too few outstanding minority candidates who might serve as models for students with little academic experience. This has also tended to reinforce the gap between minority students and whites. Not only were they separated by race and class, but also by degree of academic preparation.

In theory, the diverse groups of students would be complementary, each group would enrich and expand the experience of their counterparts. In practice, however, this idea never reached fruition. In the first few days of classes it became obvious that some of the interaction between Puerto Ricans, Blacks and whites would be characterized by conflict. Many minority students reacted by re-affirming their own culture within academia and, undoubtedly, some whites no longer attempted to understand minorities. Like society as a whole, the campus became polarized, setting the stage for racial conflict and confrontation. Although the majority of students lived in multi-racial housing, there were Black, white and Puerto Rican dormitories. White students complained that they could not enter certain areas of Black dormitories. Black students were told

by other Black students not to bring white students into Black dormitories. To a lesser extent, this separation also existed within the curriculum. Some departments and programs were composed substantially of white students and others primarily non-whites.

Tension between the social groups seemed to have reached its height on March 11, 1971 when two extraordinary incidents shook the University Community. As its Dean put it a few days later, "The first [incident] was a fight during which a Livingston student was severely beaten by a non-student visitor. A few hours later, another student was allegedly abducted from his room at gunpoint by five men, three of whom were identified as Livingston students by eyewitnesses. The abducted student was released several hours later and returned to campus unharmed."

The next day, the Dean told people at Livingston that the Provost of Rutgers University would name a University Panel on Livingston College, to look at these incidents and to search for "ways to reduce campus tensions and conflicts." The Dean urged all to help the panel. And he stressed that "The vast majority of Livingston students, faculty, and administration are justifiably fed up with the situation, which appears to be kept at a boil by the reckless and irresponsible actions, agitation, and accusations of a relatively small number of individuals." Still full of faith in Livingston's future, the Dean spoke here of a declining and soon disbanded campus group, Organization of Black Unity (OBU). Most people linked that group to the incidents and to the campus strains that led up to the beating and alleged abduction.

Thirteen faculty, staff, and students at Rutgers made up the panel, including six from Livingston, two of them Blacks and two Puerto Ricans. Its fourteenth member, Katharine Elkus White, a prominent figure in the State and a member of the Rutgers University Board of Governors, chaired the panel.

The panel met for four months, saw a small sample of Livingston students and staff, and submitted a confidential report in August. The next month, the Livingston student newspaper took a "Pentagon Papers" step and put out the text.

The panel summed up its report in the form of seven findings:

- "1. Ineffective organization and administration have exacerbated existing feeling of fear and insecurity.
2. Members of the Livingston community are uncertain who is responsible and accountable at Livingston College.
3. The general disorganization of student life has contributed to feelings of insecurity.
4. The faculty has failed to give the college a focus and sense of direction.
5. The academic programs at Livingston College do NOT cause fear and insecurity on the campus.
6. The University allowing Livingston to open without adequate resources to run an experimental college impeded Livingston's ability to take corrective action.
7. The general hostility of local communities to Livingston has fostered feelings of fear."

The administration of the College clearly bore the brunt of the panel's criticism. They attributed the severity of Livingston's problems to the failure on the part of the administration to adequately plan for and react to the needs and

insecurities of its minority students. The following quotation from that report summarizes the thrust of their conclusions.

"We found at Livingston College a degree of disorganization that exacerbated feelings of fear and insecurity that students have when they arrive at Livingston. There has been almost no attention paid to the problems of administering the College. For the first two years of the College, the student body has not been organized in any manner which might have provided some sense of order."

That report brought a quick response by the University's Central Administration and by December 1971 Dr. Bloustein was able to report that progress had been made in strengthening the administrative structure of the College. Further, he added that

"substantial progress has been made in clarifying the responsibility, titles and functions of all the Deans and other administrators at the College. A number of additional appointments and replacements have already been made, and some others are being planned."

The evidence before us suggests that these administrative changes have encouraged gradual but steady decrease in tensions between whites and non-whites.

These efforts were frustrated, however, by a continuing shortage of resources in the area of student support services. The College never had sufficient recreational and extra-curricular activities and facilities which might have operated as vehicles for the release of tensions. Budget cuts substantially impaired already deficient programs in residence education and student activities. It would have seemed wiser to have increased these extra-curricular activities and added programs such as a lecture series which would have enriched contact between faculty and students. The atmosphere of

student life was also affected by buildings that seemed to suffer from overuse. Some of the College's present facilities bear the depressing mark of too many people using too little an area. The book store is not adequate for the College's needs. The student center was never adequately utilized and proper use would demand renovation.

The lack of adequate student support services has been particularly critical at Livingston because of its geographical location. The University originally planned between three and six new colleges on the Kilmer tract. To provide ample room for the construction of the other colleges, Livingston was located in the center of that parcel of land and at considerable distance from other divisions of the University. The State's later decision to shift the expansion of its system of higher education to the community colleges prevented the University from pursuing its plans after the construction of Livingston College. This left the new college on a site which was physically and psychologically isolated from the surrounding community. Livingston is the only undergraduate college in the State University which does not have convenient access to downtown areas. This absence of an adjacent college town with its restaurants, stores, services, entertainment and supporting amenities has profoundly affected the quality of student life and worked against the College's attempt to develop a unified collegiate community.

Regardless of the responsibility for the College's failure to develop adequate student support services, whether it be the shortsightedness of its former dean, the lack of adequate resource support from the University, or the cutbacks in the appropriations by the State, every report on Livingston found deficiencies in student services and concluded that they tended to intensify fear and insecurity on the campus. The Committee has found little progress in improving the extra-curricular, recreational and other student support services at Livingston College, and believes that these deficiencies have been a major source of problems for the Livingston Community.

The lack of an effective mechanism for student participation in the governance of the College has contributed to the fear and insecurity of the students and has made it sometimes necessary for students to demonstrate in order to effectuate change within the College. In the first few years of the College, several attempts were made to organize the student body as part of an effective governance system. At first the College attempted to govern itself through direct democracy. To accomplish this end, a student faculty assembly was organized which was a variation of the early New England town meeting. All major problems were to be discussed and decided by the entire community at an assembly meeting. Every fifty students had one vote; every faculty member had one vote.

Before the first semester ended the assembly proved unworkable since students and faculty were accustomed to different procedures and tended to approach issues from different perspec-

tives. At a Livingston community meeting the decision was made to replace the assembly with a bicameral form of government. This form of government lasted for a little over a year, but never functioned very effectively. The faculty chamber, like any faculty government, dealt with academic matters, tenure and promotions. The student chamber tended to follow the pattern of its model, the faculty chamber, at the expense of becoming irrelevant to the student body which was primarily concerned with improving the quality of student life. Student participation in the chamber stopped completely when the dormitories began to develop a form of government to deal with student affairs.

Following the collapse of the student chamber there has been no organization which represents the entire student body. For a period the administration relied heavily on the highly visible and social organizations of Black and Puerto Rican students to sense the direction of student opinions. This left the white population, which comprised 75% of the students, without a means of participating in the decision-making process. In 1973, a student union was substituted for the student government. This was an action oriented organization which developed platforms and worked toward achieving specific goals. It became dominated by a small group of students and could not accommodate itself to a variety of viewpoints.

In the 1974-75 school year students became increasingly disenchanted with the union. A group called Students for Academic Alternatives was formed for the purpose of developing a new form of student government. They drafted a constitution

which was endorsed by the student body in November 1975.\* Election of officers to the new student chamber will take place next month.

The Committee believes that the development of an effective system of student government is crucial to the future of the College and hopes that the new student chamber will provide a legitimate platform for the expression of student opinion at Livingston. While the students that the Committee met felt that it was difficult to get the administration to hear their point of view, they did not seem to realize the important role that a student government could play in developing channels of communications between the students and administration of the College.

There can be no doubt that Livingston's undertaking to develop a multi-racial collegiate community was marked by conflict and confrontation. The significance of this interaction is not entirely clear. For the first time, large numbers of students were recruited from New Jersey's ghettos as well as its suburban communities. It was inevitable that they would come to the campus with radically different attitudes and life styles that would soon generate conflicts within the campus life. Dr. George Fischer, in a report on Livingston College for the New York City Board of Higher Education, argued that some confrontation between racial groups is necessary on a multi-racial campus and a sign of healthy interaction.

"If no confrontation is to be found -- in a time and place where the groups have so much to clash about -- then it means that one of them rules the rest. Insofar as no such firm grip marks the scene, confrontation is a key means by which all groups can and do live with each other."

\* A copy of the constitution is included in Appendix B.

The situation at Livingston deteriorated in 1971 not because there was conflict, but because there was no means of resolving such conflict. The administration had failed to react to challenges of its authority, and did not define the range of conduct that was acceptable within an academic community. For several years the College operated with only temporary machinery for handling disciplinary matters. Students told the Provost's panel that they were no longer reporting thefts, assaults and other illegal acts to the administration because they felt that such reporting was ineffective.

After 1971, the College began to develop procedures for resolving its conflicts under the initiative of the faculty and central administration. Steps were taken to reduce conflict by eliminating the situations which caused the difficulties. For example, during 1971 Livingston rapidly moved from its original stand against police on campus to a system of security which was tighter than any other branch of the University.

The College faculty have told us that reports on Livingston have neglected to mention the fact that the vast majority of students, Puerto Rican, Black and white, have made continuing attempts to communicate and understand one another. It was the actions of a small minority that made life difficult for the entire community. Everyone now agrees that this situation has vastly improved. In a letter to the Committee dated November 7, 1975, Dr. Bloustein stated that his evidence indicates that the efforts by students to work and live together have "been more often successful than not and that the level of racial tension has declined significantly in recent years."

We are encouraged by the reports we previously cited to measure the success of Livingston's undertaking to develop a multi-racial collegiate community by comparing its progress with that of other multi-racial urban oriented colleges. After some initial difficulties, New Jersey's effort has succeeded where those in other states have failed totally. Viewing the College from this perspective, Harold Hodgkinson rates Livingston's achievements highly. The following passage from his report summarizes his assessment:

"Livingston has probably made more progress toward the creation of a satisfactory multi-racial student and faculty climate than any other institution with which we are familiar. This is a major achievement and should be seen as such, even though at the moment empirical documentation must be content with a decline in property damage, noise level, multi-racial groups forming in classes and outside, etc."

The Committee believes that the faculty have been largely responsible for Livingston's survival through troubled times. They took the initiative to work closely with their students and their efforts fostered a strong sense of community and provided much needed leadership for the students. The faculty chamber has consistently supported attempts by students to deal with problems they face on the campus. Faculty committees have frequently been established to study student problems and make recommendations to the administration. The students that the Committee met indicated that the faculty had won their confidence through genuine interest in the academic progress of the students and sincere support for the students' attempts to deal with the problems that they face on the campus.

George Fischer goes further and attempts to describe the aspects of this experiment that are to be applauded:

"In terms of alternative options and strategies for urban schools, the main lesson is clear. In our time no such school went as far as Livingston did in what we call here its Experiment in Inter-racial Living. Insofar as the experiment can and does work in our time and place, it calls for applause and emulation. For it gets at a part of our lives which we fear a lot -- and do all too little to change. How do we get to treat each other well both as individuals and as members of groups, and not force any of us to choose between separatism and assimilation? The very depth of the problem makes it in and of itself a great schooling. When tied in with books and films and the rest of school, a strong move to do things multi-racially can -- as we see at Livingston -- add no end to growth while in college.

The Livingston experiment can teach us a lot, too, due to the need it makes clear to pay heed, much heed, to all that makes a school meaningfully multi-racial. As this preliminary report tried to show in the case of Livingston, no such mix makes sense if it lacks people from all groups -- and people that spread all through the student body, the faculty, the staff... Not least of all, a multi-racial institution must live with confrontation. It must be willing and able to face clash on clash between divergent groups that feel free to speak up, to fight, to make a majority leave true space for a minority. (But why not try to set up a school where no key group is a majority or minority?) On all these fronts, Livingston can teach us a great deal. It stuck with its experiment through hard years, as quite a few new schools fail to do. One can only wish it well."

We should also add that Livingston's efforts to deal with problems of a multi-racial college community and the solutions that they began to develop presented a powerful example for other units of the University. In a letter to the Board of Governors in June 1972 Henry Winkler, Vice President for Academic Affairs, acknowledges this contribution

to the development of the University:

"The existence of Livingston as a genuinely multi-racial community, however troubled by inevitable tensions exacerbated by administrative inexperience, has caused other units of the University, in my judgment, to rethink their own patterns of education and to question whether traditional modes of curriculum organization might not need more serious exploration than can be achieved by a little tinkering here and a reluctant change or two there."

By creating Livingston College, New Jersey has taken a major step toward creating a just institution which gives people from every segment of society a genuine opportunity to gain a college education. The College's goal of developing a multi-racial collegiate community was bound to be a difficult and controversial process. Livingston has evolved ways in which Puerto Rican, Black and white students can effectively live and work together because it has squarely faced the problems of overcoming racism in our society. We should be proud of Livingston's accomplishments and use it as an example of how we can improve our basic institutions.

C. An Evaluation of Livingston's Plan to Emphasize Interdisciplinary Study

In 1967-68 Livingston College was planning to develop an interdisciplinary program which would focus on a particular issue each year and serve as the core for the freshman curriculum. It was felt that traditional distinctions between disciplines artificially restricted inquiry and that the pressing problems of modern society demanded genuine cooperation among scholars. For a variety of reasons the College's commitment to this idea decreased by the time it opened its doors. A limited number of interdisciplinary seminars were initiated by faculty who did it along with their normal teaching load. These seminars were terminated after the first year or two when faculty decided that they did not have adequate time to devote to the development of an effective interdisciplinary approach to college teaching.

The interests of the faculty and the structure of the University tended to work against curriculum change along interdisciplinary lines. Dean Lynton had worked hard to attract an outstanding young faculty who tended to be absorbed with issues within their areas of specialization. Many still faced the problem of establishing themselves in their disciplines and did not have the interest or time to devote to developing truly interdisciplinary programs. The University-wide policy to fund faculty lines through departments also tended to maintain departmental authority over the development of courses and allotment of faculty time.

The interdisciplinary thrust at Livingston did not succeed in dramatically breaking down boundaries between disciplines, as the planners had expected, but resulted in the development of multi-disciplinary programs which were elevated to the full status of academic departments. These include African Studies, Asian Studies, Puerto Rican Studies, and a program of Women's Studies. Among them, too, are a Department of Urban Teacher Education, a program of Labor Studies, a Council of College Studies, a Department of Literatures, Languages and Linguistics, a Department of Journalism and Urban Communications, a Department of Urban Planning and the Department of Community Development.

On their own initiative, a few departments have developed interdisciplinary courses which continue to be offered. For example, faculty from the Philosophy and History Departments cooperate to offer the following courses: Intellectual and Cultural History of Modern Europe, and Philosophy of Society: Race and Class. The faculty also instituted a quasi-department called the Council on College Studies to develop and sponsor courses which do not fit into traditional departments. The Council offers 10-15 such courses each semester. The College is planning also to institute a different kind of interdisciplinary program next year for the freshmen. Faculty in philosophy, history and science, etc. would teach aspects of the freshmen studies program and a new position would be created to coordinate the program. Next year's program is likely to have an historical perspective on the development of western thought, science and technology rather than the present problem orientation.

The notion of focusing on contemporary problems seems to have had some effect on the course offerings within each of the disciplines. Each of the Departments offers a variety of courses with a contemporary orientation, e.g. Philosophical Issues in Feminism, Ideology and the Black Revolution, Seminar on Puerto Rican Community Issues, Contemporary Race Relations, and Urban Communities. Dr. Bloustein suggests that the retention of some academic boundaries may well be the most effective means of investigating social problems:

"...it is important to note that the emphasis (if not always the rhetoric) of Livingston's curriculum has always been placed more on the insights that various disciplines can bring to bear on a social problem or policy than on the development of any specifically interdisciplinary structures. The undergraduate Social Work Program, the Physician's Assistant Program and the various internship courses are all examples of attempts to teach about social problems in innovative, but not necessarily interdisciplinary, ways."

(Letter to Senate Education Committee, November 7, 1975)

Livingston College has gradually moved from its theme of social concern, with a fusion of theory with practice, to a more pragmatic tie between liberal arts and service-oriented occupations that run from community and social service to physician's assistant and health planning and management. In the words of the Dean, in a 1972 report on Livingston's development:

"The College has laid the foundation for a merging of the traditional liberal arts with professional areas in ways which are relevant to both the career objectives of students of all backgrounds as well as to societal need. The basis now exists for appropriate development in many areas."

Livingston has also instituted a variety of innovations which grant the students greater latitude to pursue their own educational goals. For example, a grading and evaluation system has been developed which removes extrinsic rewards and allows the students to be motivated by their desire for knowledge. The value of the more mature student's prior experiences has been acknowledged and college credit has been granted for these accomplishments. An extensive internship program has been developed to supplement the more theoretical aspects of the students' program.

Livingston has built a number of very strong departments which have already gained an international reputation. No less than a third of Livingston's faculty teach in the many doctoral programs of Rutgers University. Livingston itself hosts four university-wide doctoral programs: Anthropology, Comparative Literature, Computer Science and Urban Planning. Students choose from a wide spectrum of traditional as well as innovative disciplines which have been developed by the College. They also have access to the wide selection of courses and programs that are offered by other colleges in the federated system -- they are members of a small campus but have the opportunity to tap the resources of a major university. Livingston's promising undergraduates have been readily admitted into graduate programs and law, professional and medical schools. The quality of classroom instruction at Livingston meets the standard of excellence set by other divisions of the University.

The relative frequency with which undergraduate students have access to nationally ranked scholars has been important to the success of Livingston College. This is a direct result of Dean Lynton's ability to recruit many outstanding young scholars who are strongly committed to teaching. Students are generally enthusiastic about the College's academic programs and exhibit a great deal of pride in their cooperative endeavor with the faculty. Indeed it seems that the academic activities of the College have formed a common bond which has united the Livingston community through its most troubled times.

We are convinced that Livingston has the potential to become a great institution. As the College continues to send students to prestigious graduate schools and the research efforts of the faculty become more widely known, Livingston will receive well deserved praise for its educational accomplishments.

### III. THE PRESENT STATUS OF THE COLLEGE

Although Livingston has made good progress toward overcoming the problems which plagued the campus in 1971, it continues to generate controversies which are widely publicized. The most significant series of recent newspaper articles on the College dealt with the arrival of its new Dean and reactions to changes that he has proposed. Since these reports prompted the Committee to turn its attention to Livingston College, these issues will be examined as well as the events which led up to them.

Dr. Emmanuel Mesthene was chosen by the University to become Livingston College's second Dean, after an extensive search by an elected student-faculty committee for a new dean who would conduct a thorough evaluation of the College's progress and provide the leadership necessary to institute whatever changes such an analysis demanded. He was recommended for the position because the committee felt that he had the ability and background necessary to perform such a task. He was a philosophical scholar, the author of numerous books and articles on science and public policy, and the former director of the Harvard University program on technology and society.

Dean Mesthene's initial impression was that Livingston has been too permissive and unorganized to insure that all students receive a first-rate college education. He was particularly concerned about the effectiveness of the advisory and academic support programs for educationally disadvantaged students. Since the College had never collected the kind of data that would be sufficient to assess these programs, Dean Mesthene recommended

that some objective method be developed to help the faculty measure the quality of their basic skills courses. He suggested that this might be accomplished by administering a general examination to those students who had exhibited educational deficiencies upon entrance to the College after they had completed the present basic skills program. Presumably, this would help the College evaluate and improve their basic skills program and provide a procedure for "recycling" students who need further assistance in basic skills areas.

The Dean's suggestion provoked a great deal of controversy and he was criticized for attempting to impose a literacy examination. One student group accused Dean Mesthene's administration of racism, alleging that the purpose of such an examination was to circumvent Livingston's commitment to Black and Puerto Rican students. This criticism appears to have been unwarranted since the Dean was genuinely concerned about the quality of the support programs for educationally disadvantaged students. His intentions seemed good but the manner in which he proceeded had not taken the views of the students and faculty into account.

To avoid future controversy and expedite the College's re-evaluation of the basic skills programs, Dean Mesthene appointed a Faculty Advisory Board on Developmental Education consisting of seven members of the faculty plus the Chairperson of the Academic Foundations Department and the Chairperson of the English Department. The functions of the Board, which it will perform in close consultation with specialists in developmental education in the College and outside, will include:

- A. The evaluation of all existing basic skills instructional activities at Livingston.

- B. Overseeing the work of an acting coordinator for developmental education.
- C. The preparation of recommendations regarding a long-range plan for developmental education at Livingston, including recommendations for the year 1976-77; these recommendations should be reported to the faculty chamber not later than February 1, 1976.

The Committee has reviewed these tasks with members of the Board and supports their efforts to revise the basic skills program which is vital to the success of Livingston College.

More serious criticism of the new Dean has come from faculty who question his commitment to their effort to develop a multi-racial collegiate community and his support of warranted academic innovation. Although it is still too early to tell where his loyalties lie, they fear that the direction of the College will shift under Dean Mesthene's leadership. Certainly many of his initial actions have strengthened the present programs and he has expressed his desire to pursue the College's present goals. In a speech before the faculty last September he said:

"I do believe that Livingston has a special commitment, not merely to welcome and admit, but actively to seek out and recruit, promising students who have the potential of benefiting from a college education but whose cultural, social, racial, ethnic, or economic backgrounds are different from those traditionally associated with 'going to college.' I believe Livingston has the obligation to provide such non-traditional students with special opportunities and programs designed to help them develop the learning skills and social attributes that make for success in college. And I believe that Livingston should provide all its students a first-class education and a first-class degree."

Consistent with these words are the major changes that he has instituted or attempted during his first year. Some obvious examples are the establishment of the Advisory Board on Developmental Education, the improvement of the administrative structure, and his efforts to improve the quality of student life.

The Committee's observations of the present situation have led it to conclude that these recent controversies have been caused primarily by the manner in which the Dean proceeded rather than by disagreement over the substance of his remarks. Dean Mesthene has attempted to lead the College before he has gained the confidence of the faculty or developed credibility with a student body which has grown accustomed to treating the administration with suspicion and mistrust. The Committee has encouraged the Dean to speak more openly with the students and meet more frequently with them. Dean Mesthene has increased his efforts in this area by attending more campus functions, instituting a bi-weekly Dean's Hour and writing a regular column in the campus newspaper. There is no doubt that the Dean is seriously working on this problem and that he must continue to do so if he is to win the confidence of the students and convince them that he is genuinely interested in their problems.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

The Senate Education Committee of the New Jersey Legislature, after a thorough examination of Livingston College by the Committee Staff and a careful analysis by the Committee itself, expresses its strong support for the unique goals and innovative programs of the College. Livingston College has injected new energy in New Jersey's system of higher education by subjecting traditional educational methods to careful scrutiny and developing new approaches where they had failed to meet the present needs of our students. Its curriculum has emphasized urban study, an area which has long been neglected in undergraduate education. In creating Livingston College, New Jersey has taken a step to strengthen our democracy by granting every citizen of this State, regardless of their race or economic background, access to the State University. We hope that Livingston will continue to recruit young people from all sectors of society and develop a curriculum which focuses on the contemporary problems of our cities.

The Senate Education Committee is impressed by the caliber of the faculty of Livingston College and the quality of its academic programs. Classroom instruction meets the standard of excellence set by other divisions of our State University. Upon concluding this examination of the College, the Committee has only found four areas which need significant improvement. The Committee found that (1) the student life and support services fail to meet the needs of that geographically isolated community, (2) the basic skills program is not completely effective,

(3) the students lack an effective means of participating in the governance of the College, and (4) the University's procedure and the State guidelines for determining EOF eligibility frustrate the College's effort to recruit able minority students. The College, the University and the Department of Higher Education are encouraged to re-assess these areas and to take the steps that are necessary to improve them.

## APPENDIX A

### Reports and Documents Utilized in the Preparation of this Report

1. Minutes of the Curriculum Planning Committee of Livingston College, 1967-1969.
2. Minutes of the Faculty Chamber, 1969-1975.
3. Annual Report of Livingston College, 1967-1975.
4. Speeches by Dean Mesthene; September 11, 1974, February 26 1975.
5. Proposal for Renovations of Tillet Hall, 1975.
6. "Report on Livingston College for Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools," October 13, 1970.
7. "Assessment of the Program of Livingston College," Harold Hodgkinson and Lavinnia Hammond, 1972.
8. "Alternative Options and Strategies of Metropolitan Public Colleges, a National Survey for the Board of Higher Education, City of New York Preliminary Report No. 7: Livingston College," George Fischer, 1973.
9. "A Crisis in Confidence: The Report of the Rutgers University Panel on Livingston College," 1971.
10. "Report on Prior Work Experience" by Dr. Ernest Schwarcz, 1973.

11. Livingston College Catalogue, 1974-1975.
12. "The Educational Opportunity Fund Fourth Annual Report,"  
New Jersey Department of Higher Education, 1973-1974.
13. Letters from President Edward Bloustein  
to The Board of Governors, December 7, 1971  
to The Senate Education Committee, November 7, 1975.
14. Letter from Henry Winkler, Vice President for Academic  
Affairs, to the Board of Governors, June 26, 1972.

## APPENDIX B

### THE NEW STUDENT CHAMBER CONSTITUTION

#### PREAMBLE

(1.01) We, the undergraduate students of Livingston college, in order to insure the ideals to which this institution is committed: academic freedom, cultural diversity, responsiveness to an ever changing society, and to establish a unified foundation for representative student involvement, do hereby establish this constitution for the Livingston Student Chamber.

#### MEMBERSHIP

Any undergraduate registered for full or part time study in Livingston College and any undergraduates in the Colleges of Pharmacy and Engineering who are affiliated with Livingston College in a program leading to a degree, diploma, or certificate from the college shall be eligible to be a representative in the Livingston Student Chamber.

#### REFERENDUM

(3.01) The referendum is the highest decision making instrument of the L.S.C. and may be used to challenge any decision or course of action of any organ of Student Government.

(3.02) A majority decision made by a valid referendum voids any conflicting decision of any organ of Student government and may only be overturned in a subsequent referendum.

(3.03) No action of a referendum shall be construed to limit the functioning of any committee, office, officer or organ of the L.S.C. except as explicitly stated.

(3.04) Referendum shall be administered and validated by the standing elections committee of the L.S.C. who shall determine regulations and procedures for referenda as well as elections with the approval of the majority of the L.S.C.

(3.05) No referendum shall be valid without the participation of at least 25% of the membership of the Livingston student body based on the latest available figures from the registrar. A simple majority of the percentage voting will carry the referendum.

(3.06) Referendum may be called by a petition of 10% of the Livingston student body, and presented to the speaker of the Livingston Student Chamber.

(3.07) When a referendum has been legally called for, it shall be held within fifteen (15) class days of the call, but at least three class days after the call.

#### THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH

(4.01) The legislative branch of the Student Government shall be known as the Livingston Student Chamber.

(4.02) The Livingston Student Chamber shall establish the goals and priorities of the student government through the passage of basic policy declarations. These declarations are then to be forwarded to the appropriate joint student faculty committee for action.

(4.03) If it so desires the L.S.C. may consider action mandates to direct a committee or committees to execute a basic policy declaration in a certain manner. It may pass an action mandate at any meeting following the one in which the policy declaration was originally passed, in the event that the L.S.C. is not satisfied by the progress a committee or various committees has made.

(4.09) Impeachment proceedings may be brought against any voting member of the L.S.C. by a majority vote of the L.S.C. membership including the speaker. A vote of 2/3 of the membership present and voting shall be necessary for removal from office. In the case of impeachment of an officer the elections committee must arrange for new elections within a period of two weeks. In the case where a treasurer or secretary acts as speaker in the event of his/her impeachment, a committee shall be chosen to act as L.S.C. secretary until the official holder of that office returns.

#### MEMBERSHIP

(4.05) The L.S.C. shall consist of thirty one (31) representatives and one speaker who is elected internally from among the representatives making up the L.S.C.

(4.06) Delegates to the L.S.C. shall be divided proportionately among the commuter and resident student populations according to the latest figures available from the registrar. THERE SHALL BE, upon the election of this government, fifteen (15) representatives from the Livingston Quads five (5) representatives from each quad, and seventeen (17) representatives from among the commuter population. These numbers represent a proportion of one (1) representative per one hundred (100) students. Subsequent changes in the housing pattern of the college shall result in the appropriate addition or subtraction of representatives, to be decided upon by the elections committee, keeping within the guidelines of one representative per every hundred students.

(4.07) Should any representative including the Speaker or any committee member become inoperative, the selection of members for that constituency shall be selected in an election conducted by the L.S.C. elections committee.

(4.08) Representatives from any one quad, or from among the commuters shall decide among themselves the means by which their constituency can be divided proportionally as outlined above, to insure adequate representation and access to representatives. This provision does not, however, restrict any student from speaking to or conferring with representatives acting as a member of the L.S.C.

#### OFFICERS

(4.09) The Speaker of the L.S.C. shall be elected internally by the membership of the L.S.C. The speaker will preside over the L.S.C. sessions and will be chairperson of the ex-

ecutive committee. In presiding over the L.S.C. sessions and will be chairperson of the exective committee. In presiding over the L.S.C. the speaker will be responsible for running the meeting according to Roberts rules of order, setting time limit on debate, and enacting the agenda. Agenda will not be decided by the speaker but will be set through the means of a sign up sheet, order being decided by the order in which the various items for the agenda are signed up. It is the responsiblity of the speaker to enact all items on the agenda. The speaker has a vote in all matters decided by the L.S.C. and in all committees of which he is a member. In addition the speaker may attend any committee meeting, but may vote only on those committees of which he is a member.

(4.10) The L.S.C. shall elect a secretary whose purpose shall be to call roll, coordinate inter-committee business and informing the executive committee of policy decisions made by the L.S.C. In addition, the L.S.C. shall hire a recording secretary who is NOT a member of the L.S.C. and whose responsibility is to keep accurate minutes of the meetings of the L.S.C., and for all correspondence concerning the Livingston student government.

(4.11) The L.S.C. shall elect a treasurer who shall be responsible for handling all monetary matters concerning the L.S.C. He is the only person who is permitted to withdraw money from the L.S.C. account.

#### PROCEDURES

(4.12) Meetings shall be held regularly on a bi-monthly basis while classes are in session. All meetings shall be public.

(4.13) A quorum shall consist of 16 members of the L.S.C.

(4.14) Each member of the L.S.C. shall have the power to cast one vote.

(4.14) Special meetings may be called by the speaker, or by a petition of 16 representatvies in the L.S.C. Such a special meeting will be held within two (2) school days of the call and business transacted at a special meeting shall be restricted to that specified in a notice stating time, place and agenda.

(4.16) After three (3) meetings of the L.S.C. any voting member with an absentee rate greater than  $33 \frac{1}{3}$  (thirty three and one third percent) shall automatically be removed from the Chamber, and his/her seat declared vacant.

(4.17) Extenuating circumstances may be considered. A vote of three quarters ( $\frac{3}{4}$ ) of the members present may override section 4.16. Any discussion of extenuating circumstances shall be limited to five minutes. Other outside activities shall not be accepted as an excuse for the neglect of Chamber responsibilities.

(4.18) Robert's Rules of Order shall be the Parliamentary Authority for all matters of the L.S.C. not covered in this Constitution.

(4.19) Voting by proxy shall be prohibited.

(4.20) The L.S.C. shall be chosen with the exception of the year 1975, during the third week in September and shall have its first meeting during the first week of October. The term of the L.S.C. shall be one school year.

(4.21) In the event of a vacancy on the L.S.C. the Election Committee shall determine the procedure for replacement and shall secure a replacement as soon as possible.

(4.22) **It is expected that members of the L.S.C. will act with diligence, honesty and good faith in the best interests of the STUDENTS of Livingston College and affiliated colleges.**

#### EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

(5.01) The executive branch shall consist of a committee known as the executive council.

(5.02) The executive council will be responsible for the review of nominations to the

(5.03) The council membership will be constituted by representatives elected internally from among the L.S.C. The committee will be composed of 5 members. Procedure for the election to the committee will be through a simple list, the top 5 vote receivers being elected to the committee.

(5.04) The executive council shall meet once on a weekly basis.

(5.05) A quorum shall consist of a majority voting members of the executive council.

(5.06) Roberts Rules of Order shall be the Parliamentary authority for all matters within the executive council not covered by this constitution.

(5.07) **After three (3) meetings of the Executive Council, any member with an absentee rate greater than  $33 \frac{1}{3}$  (thirty three and one third) percent shall automatically be removed from the Council and that Council seat declared vacant.**

(5.08) Extenuating circumstances may be considered. A three quarters vote of the members present may override section 5.07. Any discussion of extenuating circumstances may be considered. A three quarters vote of the members present may override section 5.07. Any discussion of extenuating circumstances shall be limited to five minutes. Other outside activities shall not be accepted as an excuse for the neglect of council duties.

#### COMMITTEES

(6.01) Upon the election of the government, and upon the election of the Executive Council, it will be the responsibility of the Executive Council to meet with the appropriate members of the faculty in order to arrange the composition and powers of the joint student faculty committees as specified in section VII of the Faculty Chamber bylaws. Students shall be represented on all possible committees operating in the Faculty Chamber. In addition, any representative of the L.S.C. may attend any meeting of the Executive Council and any meeting of a joint student faculty committee. However only members of respective council or committees may have final vote in matters to be decided by said council or committees.

(6.02) Standing Committee — There shall be standing committee of this Student Government as outlined below. The L.S.C. may at any time establish or dissolve additional standing committees to provide for the varying needs of the students.

(6.03) To further the general welfare of the students of Livingston College the L.S.C. may

(6.04) Members of standing and ad hoc student committees are to be selected on a volunteer basis. If more students volunteer than the number of spaces available, an election will be held. The students receiving the most votes will attain a seat, the second most votes another seat and so on until all seats are filled.

(6.05) All rules and procedures for the running of the committees, electing of chairpersons and delegation of powers shall be decided by the membership of the particular committee, voted upon and set down in some formal manner. This procedure must be accomplished before the committee may assume its work.

(6.06) The Fee Board Committee shall be responsible for the control of and allocation of all student fees. This committee shall assume control of both the Program and Fee Boards. It shall consist of seven (7) members.

(6.07) The Student Health Committee shall be responsible for evaluating the condition of student life and student health services and of making recommendations to the L.S.C. concerning the improvement of student health services and student life.

(6.08) The Elections Committee shall be responsible for the setting up, running and arbitration of elections of representatives to the L.S.C. In addition, it is responsible for running a referendum initiated by the students. Their duties entail also the setting up, running and arbitration of recall elections. They may appoint students who are not representatives for the execution of their duties. There shall be seven members on this committee.

#### RECALL PROCEDURES

(7.01) If a representative is not doing his/her job according to the standards of the majority of his/her constituents, a petition signed by 1/2 of said constituents is necessary to initiate recall procedures. The students can present this petition directly to any member of the Election Committee of the L.S.C. The Elections Committee will supervise the recall election. If in the recall election, 2/3 of the students vote to remove the representative, he is automatically removed from office. At such a time the election committee will act promptly to hold new elections.

#### AMENDMENTS

(8.01) Any amendment to this constitution may be proposed by any member of the L.S.C. The said amendment must be presented to each L.S.C. representative at least one week in advance of the L.S.C. meeting. It shall require

a two-thirds (2/3) vote of the L.S.C. to put the amendment on a referendum in which students may accept or reject.

(8.02) An amendment may also be proposed by a petition submitted to the speaker signed by ten percent of the student body. When this is done, the matter will be placed on a referendum. The constitutional change can be implemented with a 75% affirmative vote by the L.S.C. in the referendum.

(8.03) Final interpretation of this constitution shall rest with the Executive Council.

(8.04) The L.S.C. however, may override the Executive Council's interpretation by a two-thirds vote.