

**MINUTES OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEETING OF THE
BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION OF THE CITY OF NEW YORK**

HELD

FEBRUARY 9, 1971

**AT THE BOARD HEADQUARTERS BUILDING
535 EAST 80 STREET—BOROUGH OF MANHATTAN**

The Chairman called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

There were present:

Francis Keppel, Chairman
David Ashe
Herbert Berman

Frederick Burkhardt
James Oscar Lee
Luis Quero Chiesa

N. Michael Carfora, Secretary of the Board
Arthur H. Kahn, General Counsel

Chancellor Albert H. Bowker
Deputy Chancellor Seymour C. Hyman

Vice-Chancellor Timothy S. Healy
Vice-Chancellor Bernard Mintz

The absence of Mr. Poses was excused.

At this point the Committee heard representatives of the University Faculty Senate, the Legislative Conference, the United Federation of College Teachers and the CUNY Council of the American Association of University Professors, re the Board's Statement of Policy on The Organization and Governance of The City University of New York.

Upon motion duly made, seconded and carried, the following resolution was adopted:

**NO. 1. STATEMENT OF POLICY ON THE ORGANIZATION AND GOVERNANCE OF THE CITY
UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK: RESOLVED**, That the following Statement of Policy on the Organization and
Governance of The City University of New York be adopted:

**STATEMENT OF POLICY
ON THE
ORGANIZATION AND GOVERNANCE OF THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK**

On May 5, 1969, the Board of Higher Education adopted a statement on "The Restructuring of
Governance at City University." That statement, in part, reads as follows:

The structure of a university in society must be responsive to the legitimate needs of its members. To do this today requires the creation of new processes for communication and decision-making which permit each group of participants to feel that it can influence the institution as a matter of both right and responsibility.

The establishment of such processes will not stifle dissent or eliminate the conflict of ideas which are central to the concept of a university. Rather, it would serve to create a climate in which rationality could be focused upon the issues which its members consider to be of greatest importance.

In considering the restructuring of the University towards these ends, four problems of major significance are evident.

1. The rapid growth in the size and complexity of the University makes it more difficult for the Board of Higher Education to be as responsive as it must be to the needs of the individual colleges. Means must be found of moving the focus of major decision-making closer to the colleges.

2. The present bylaws of the Board mandate similar patterns of institutional governance at each college. Means must be found to permit the institutions to take part in creating their own variations in patterns of governance.

3. There is at present no system enabling all members of the community to participate fully in University governance. Means must be found to create a flexible and responsive pattern for governance at the University-wide level.

4. Present policies and practices related to educational matters such as admissions and the creation of new curriculums should be reviewed. Means must be found of including the entire community in periodic examinations of such matters.

I. Despite the efforts of the Board to increase the participation of all groups in University governance, numerous factors have continued the pressure for increased centralization of control, policy and operation of the University. This increased tendency toward centralization has become a counterforce to the individual college's ability to operate autonomously and has increasingly slowed the ability of the University to react calmly, sensibly, and in a forward-looking way.

The advent of collective negotiations, under the Taylor Act, has been a noteworthy legal as well as practical, pressure toward centralization of University responsibilities. Under the law, the collective negotiating agents have exercised their right to deal with the University as a whole. The resulting contracts and structures have tended to make the office of the Chancellor the obvious direct court of appeals. Application of the contracts has also tended to impose uniform and rigid personnel practices across the entire University.

The funding agencies and their bureaus within the City, State and Federal Governments have made it increasingly clear that they no longer propose to deal with 20 separate units when they have available to them the choice of dealing only with the office of the Chancellor on behalf of all the units.

The expanding capital facilities program is vital to the growth and well-being of the University and all of its units. It is also true that the law which provides for the financing of this program, as well as the natural characteristics of capital programs, in terms of overall priorities and comparability of programs again tends to result in centralization of authority.

The State laws requiring University Master Plans and internal coordination of academic programs also have increased the pressures toward centralized policy making and control.

Last but by no means least of all the pressures are those that emanate from the growth of discontent in the student body; the rising aspirations of the minority communities, the student communities' demands for control of their own destinies, and the experiences of the public with the Board of Education. All these groups in times of crisis appear to be convinced that they must seek their victories at the office of the Board of Higher Education and not on the college campuses.

This increasing centralization of power and functional responsibility has literally overloaded the capacities of the members of the Board of Higher Education to discharge their responsibilities. The demands made on board members in terms of time as well as emotional resources are unconscionable and in fact are damaging to their ability to exercise their responsibilities in terms of problems at a policy making level. To this must be added the observation that presidential authority has been increasingly limited by the exercise of faculty prerogatives in personnel matters, in educational policy, as well as in the management of departmental operations. The limitations on presidential authority at the departmental chairman's level tend to restrict the presidential scope of activity at that level. In the same sense the active involvement of the Board in college business tends to limit the president's flexibility. Only recently the University has at last attained a reasonable degree of budgetary flexibility. It is now possible for the president to break away from the severe limitations of prior budgetary rigidity and make use of this flexibility substantially to improve internal college management and bring about academic reform and innovation that had not heretofore been possible. In practice, this tool can only be effective if academic quality management can be substantially improved down to and through the departmental level.

It is proposed that this trend to administrative implosion be reversed by a reestablishment and an enhancement of presidential responsibility and authority in connection with matters concerning his college. This should be accompanied by a parallel reemphasis on the responsibilities of the faculty to govern themselves with respect to appointments, promotions, tenure and the academic program. The faculty's responsibility for attention to duty, attention to teaching responsibilities, and limitation of outside involvements, as well as a reexamination of the department chairman's responsibility to the president as well as to his department colleagues, all are matters that are now being reexamined by the University Faculty Senate. The Board, through its Committee on Governance will continue to seek ways of increasing decentralization at all levels of the University.

It is, however, very clear now that in the absence of direct presidential management authority at the department level the present college, divisional and departmental operating procedures must be altered to encourage the development of academic excellence through faculty direction.

The chairman, as a faculty member of a given department, must have the confidence of the department members in order to provide academic leadership within the particular discipline in addition to his responsibility for the management of the department. This confidence can best be assured by continuing the practice of periodically electing chairmen by and from the faculty of the department. This must, however, be coupled with the clear presidential authority to appoint a department chairman at any time when the best interests of the college necessitate such action. Such authority necessarily includes the power of removal where necessary. Neither of these actions would be undertaken without prior consultation with the faculty of the department involved. Such actions are subject to the approval of the Board of Higher Education.

While the primary responsibility for the development and preservation of academic excellence is located in the faculty the ultimate responsibility rests with the president who is directly responsible to the Board. While this may be taken for granted, the bylaws of the Board should state explicitly to the college community that the president shall have the affirmative responsibility of conserving and enhancing the educational standards and general academic excellence of the college under his jurisdiction. Such responsibility shall include but not be limited to the duty to insure that his recommendations for the appointment, promotion and the granting of tenure are in accord with the immediate and long range interests of the college and that such recommendations contribute to the improvement of the academic excellence of the college.

In addition to improving the faculties' ability to uphold the quality of the academic program, which is treated in greater detail below, and the restatement of presidential responsibility in this area, the reinforcement of general presidential authority would require only minor changes in the Board's existing bylaws and policies.

First, the bylaws should be amended to eliminate the presently existing college committees of the Board and the Board should resolve itself to function through its presently existing functional committees, with the addition of new committees as the need arises. This will make it clear that the Board will deal on a functional basis with those matters of policy and principle that relate to all of the units of the University. Routine items concerning the internal operations of the individual colleges would be submitted directly to the Board rather than through the college committees. The technical screening of these matters will be handled by the Chancellor's office. The Board's policy agenda will then be limited to those matters of University-wide policy interest. It is intended that this procedure will clearly indicate to all involved that the president has the authority and responsibility for all college affairs and that local matters will be administered and settled at the campus level within the framework of established Board policy.

The Chairman of the Board shall appoint a member of the Board to serve as liaison with each college. Appointments shall be made annually on a rotating basis.

The emphasis of Board operations will be directed to the monitoring and developing of University-wide policy in functional areas through committees named to deal with specific areas.

All special and functional committees of the Board will have student and faculty representation with non-voting status. The members will be designated by the University Faculty Senate and the University Student Senate, although they will not serve as formal representatives of the Senates.

Second, the bylaws should be amended to provide for the establishment of a second Vice-Chairman who will be included as a member of the Executive Committee, in order to deal with the press of business and properly to divide the workload of the functional committees as well as to make it possible for the Board Chairman to discharge his responsibilities with a reasonable expenditure of time. It is anticipated that with the addition of a second Vice-Chairman, it will be practical for the Chairman to be active or be represented on each of the Board's committees.

Third, there is an additional element in this new structure that is vital to the preservation of the whole under the operation of college and presidential autonomy. For the Board to function properly, the Chancellor, its chief officer, will be vested with the authority to manage the agenda and to provide appropriate documentation. All agenda items must have been considered and approved by a committee of the Board or the Chancellor. Many items, including the routine Chancellor's Report, will appear as recommendations of the President approved by the Chancellor.

The Chancellor, at the University level, should have available a mechanism to provide, from as broad a base as possible, the opinions and recommendations of the University's general public. The Ad Hoc Committee for the City University now provides this input on an informal basis as the need arises. It is now recommended that the Ad Hoc Committee be reconstituted as the University lay advisory council with membership designated by the organizations now represented on the Ad Hoc Committee, with the exception of the student, faculty and alumni groups for whom formal representation has been provided at other points in the University structure.

To ensure that the president has available to him the widest range of views and expertise in the consideration of college policy formulation, each president may establish an advisory council or councils. If the president so desires, the membership of the advisory council or councils may include a member of the Board of Higher Education.

Members of the college advisory councils are to be appointed by the Board of Higher Education as follows: where there is organizational representation the organization will designate its representatives; representatives from the surrounding geographical area will be nominated by the president and representatives from the City at large will be nominated by the Board of Higher Education. Students and faculty are not to be included on the councils since these groups should be fully represented through the formal internal college structure.

II. As an additional means of realizing the aims expressed in its statement of May 5, 1969, the Board at that time indicated that it would "... view with favor as a substitute for those sections of Article VIII (Organization and Duties of the Faculty) and Article IX (Organization and Duties of Faculty Departments) and other related sections of the Bylaws, which relate to the internal governance of the colleges and membership on any and all college committees, a new set of Bylaws for any unit of the University which wishes to create and propose a new governance structure."

While a good deal of movement has been made toward reform of local governance, the process has been slow and tedious. During the past year, numerous problems and disputes have arisen concerning University and college governance. These matters have been the focus of attention of the University Student Senate, the University Faculty Senate, the Administrative Council, the Board's Committee on Law and the Board itself. This attention, however, has not produced lasting solutions to the problems raised. There has clearly been no lack of concern or effort in this area. The Board is well aware that the preparations for open admissions as well as student disruptions have been major factors in absorbing the focus of attention at the college level.

The Board at this time feels constrained to reiterate the closing paragraphs of its May 5, 1969 statement.

If the City University is to function effectively, channels of communication must always be available for the peaceful and reasoned discussion and decision of all problems which affect the educational process. At the same time, violent disruption of the activities of the City University and its component colleges must not continue. The Board notes the recent statement by the American Council on Education:

"If universities will not govern themselves, they will be governed by others. This elementary reality is increasingly becoming understood by all components of the university community."

The Board reiterates the pledge in its 1968 Master Plan that both students and faculty should participate in the decision-making process at all units of the City University. The Board pledges its best efforts to improve, and to increase the scope and effectiveness of such participation.

The Board has a paramount duty both to the academic community and to the people of this City to use its best efforts to ensure that the orderly working of the University shall continue. We ask the cooperation of the academic community and of all the people of this City to help us achieve this end.

With the intention of exercising its responsibility to the University community and the people of this City, the Board now reaffirms its commitment to achieve solutions to the four problems set out in its statement of May 5, 1969, and to that end, the Board issues the following statements and guidelines for college governance to guide the colleges in the development of new governance structures and to resolve some of the existing problems with respect to college governance. Concurrent with the adoption of this statement, the Chairman of the Board is directed to appoint a Committee on Governance. The Committee on Governance will be charged with the responsibility of reporting to the Board, after consultation with members of the University community, on the progress made toward the solution of governance problems within the University and recommendations for amendments to this statement. In addition, the Committee will present to the Board at such time as may be appropriate a comprehensive report on the status of governance at the City University and recommendations for future action in this area.

The University

(a) The size and complexity of the university make it imperative that the focus of decision-making be moved closer to the colleges. At the same time it must be possible for all sectors of the university community to participate in decisions appropriately reached at the university level, and for the Board of Higher Education to exercise its overall responsibility while encouraging variations in local governance.

There are, in fact, two kinds of representation at the university level: first, the representation of constituent interests, now appropriately handled through the University Student Senate and the University Faculty Senate; second, the representation of individual colleges and the policies and practices which they have adopted through their own procedures of governance under established university regulations. These two patterns of representation do not lend themselves easily to combined representation on a basis of numerical equality. Moreover, the adequate representation of college needs and views at the university level can be achieved only through an organization in which each college is represented.

For this reason, some organization made up of the principal officers of the colleges, the presidents, appears indispensable. The Administrative Council, as it is now constituted and organized, has proven to be unwieldy. It is, therefore, recommended that the Administrative Council be replaced by a Council of Presidents, consisting of the college presidents, with the chancellor as chairman and the deputy chancellor as an ex-officio member. (Other members of the central staff should be available during the regular meetings of the council as their knowledge, expertise and advice are needed.)

To facilitate the development of joint positions on matters of university policy, the Council of Presidents should elect an executive committee to meet periodically with the executive committees of the University Faculty Senate and the University Student Senate on matters of mutual concern. The joint executive committees would be empowered to establish joint functional committees if and when appropriate.

(b) In an effort to ensure that present policies and practices related to educational and management matters within the colleges and the University are satisfactorily meeting the needs of the University community, and to involve the entire community in periodic evaluations of such matters, the Chancellor is directed to provide for a performance audit of each college and of the central administration. Such audit is to be performed every five years by a panel chosen by the Board of Higher Education from outside the University. The panel shall be directed to review all aspects of the colleges' operation and to consult with students, faculty and administrators of the college under review. The report of the audit shall be widely distributed to all members of the college community and the Board and reviewed by the Council of Presidents which shall make recommendations to the Board on the basis of its review.

The Colleges

The statements which follow are designed to guide the colleges in the development of new governance structures, which when properly approved will replace the structure specified by the bylaws of the Board.

(a) The focus of major decision-making within the University is properly at the college level. Such decisions should not be interfered with by the University administration except where a college decision may affect another college or the University as a whole. Such decisions should not be altered by the Board, except where by virtue of its responsibility to the University community and the general community, action is deemed necessary to protect the legitimate interest of groups or individuals within the college community.

To ensure the integrity of college-level decision-making, new processes for communication and decision-making, which permit each group of participants to feel that it can influence the institution as a matter of right and responsibility must be established. Each college should be free to create its own governance structure to enable it to create a climate in which rationality can be focused upon the issues, which its members consider to be of the greatest academic importance.

The college community is composed of three basic elements, i.e., students, the primary reasons for the college's existence; faculty, the primary means of the development, preservation and transmission of knowledge; and the administration, which in addition to providing managerial and technical services, exists to provide leadership to the students, faculty and the college community as a unit.

In addition to these three groups, there exists others that influence and are influenced by the institution and should be provided with a means of participation in the process of decision making. These include the members of the general public of the City; the alumni of the college; and the members of the clerical, custodial and professional administrative staffs. College governance structures should include formal means of communication with these groups and provide for participation in the making of decisions which can reasonably be said to affect their interests.

(b) The President: In the context of this section, the term President includes the members of the college administration who are directly responsible to him and are appointed by him. The selection of a President to serve an individual college must be made by the Board of Higher Education as an exercise of its responsibility for the operation of the University. However, representatives of the college community will serve with the Board's search committee and an appointment will ordinarily be made by the Board only upon the recommendation of the search committee and the Chancellor.

The primary responsibility of the President is the conserving and enhancing of the educational program of the college under his jurisdiction and the providing of leadership to the college community for the purpose of achieving these ends. To carry out these responsibilities as the executive officer of the college, the President has the final responsibility and authority for decisions in the following areas: the quality of the faculty and academic leadership; preparation of the college budget and allocation of monies within the college; preparation and implementation of the college Master Plan; general management of the clerical, custodial and professional administrative staffs, the maintenance of order and the disciplining of members of the college community whose conduct threatens that order; and the general administration of the college in such a way as to meet the needs of the students and faculty and resolve disputes which may arise within the college community. While the President must hold the final responsibility and authority in these areas, the exercise of this authority should be governed by the following principles:

i) The final responsibility for development of the faculty must lie with the chief academic officer, the President. To this end, the President has the affirmative responsibility for passing on all faculty personnel actions, and in the case of the granting of tenure, the President should rely on the judgment of experts in the various disciplines to aid him in making a final decision. In cases of controversial, early, or other special tenure decisions, consultation with faculty members or other qualified persons within or outside the City University may be appropriate. Such consultation should be undertaken together with, or in agreement with, an appropriate elected faculty body-departmental divisional or college wide-within the college or University.

ii) Budgetary and Planning matters affect all aspects of the college community and, therefore, decisions in this area should be arrived at only after all members of the community have had a formal opportunity to make their views known.

iii) Matters of discipline must be handled in such a way as to provide for the protection of all individuals' rights to due process. The procedures must also protect the rights of the community and preserve the integrity of the college. For these procedures to be effective, the members of the community must share a commitment to the principle of institutional self-governance.

iv) The general administration of the college exists to serve the needs of the faculty and students and as an extension of the President's leadership role. Administrators are appointed by the president and responsible to him, and these administrators, together with the President as members of the college community, should be included in all college decision-making bodies since they will be responsible for implementing such decisions.

(c) The Faculty: Subject to the Board of Higher Education, the faculty is primarily responsible for academic matters, including the criteria for admission and retention of students, promulgation of rules concerning attendance, the awarding of credit and degrees, the quality of teaching, research and the guidance of students, and the general quality and advancement of the academic program of the college. The responsibility for the academic program extends to the personnel responsible for that program and, therefore, includes the selection, retention, promotion and quality of the faculty.

i) Matters having to do with the academic program, including student disciplining as a result of academic infractions, are the primary responsibility of the faculty. This responsibility carries with it not only the right to have the controlling influence in this area, but also the duty to contribute the time and effort necessary to satisfy this responsibility. Since the academic program owes its existence primarily to the student body it serves, the students should have a participating role in the academic decision-making process. Likewise, the administrators, who are to be charged with carrying out the decisions, should participate in the formulation of policy. All students and faculty are members of the college community and provision should be made for the representation in the decision-making process of all classes of students, full-time, part-time, matriculated, non-matriculated and students enrolled in special programs; and all classes of faculty, full-time, part-time, tenured, non-tenured, adjunct and visiting faculty.

Each department should be encouraged to develop a long range plan with regard to tenure policy. By having available information which clearly sets forth the consequences of tenuring members of the faculty in varying percentages, the department can be aided in setting guidelines for future tenure appointments. The criteria for all tenure appointments, however, must remain those of academic excellence, ability and merit without consideration to fixed quotas or percentages, but with consideration of long term effects on the growth, flexibility and excellence of the department and the institution.

While continuity is a valuable feature in a decision-making process, methods must be provided to permit the presentation of new ideas, and the promotion of experimentation designed to promote change. To this end, the academic decision-making process should provide for participatory input on the part of new and younger faculty members, and should provide means for the periodic change of leadership within the decision-making structure.

ii) The faculty has always had and shall continue to have the primary responsibility in the recruitment, promotion and retention of the faculty. The faculty has a special interest and responsibility to itself and for the good of the entire college community to ensure that the quality of its membership is maintained at a high level and that it continues to be responsive to the needs and aspirations of the student body. To ensure fairness and impartiality in personnel matters, those bodies at the departmental, divisional and college level which are charged with the responsibility of exercising the faculty's role in personnel matters should draw their membership from the faculty by election. One of the major functions of the undergraduate faculty member is classroom instruction and the consumers of that service, the students, are specially qualified to contribute to an

evaluation of the quality of classroom instruction. The faculty, therefore, has the responsibility to tap this resource and to provide for a participatory role for students in personnel decisions that are based in whole, or in part, on teaching effectiveness and the general student-teacher relationship. This may, but need not, include student membership on personnel and budget committees.

Student evaluations of faculty classroom and teaching performance should be institutionalized as one among a number of factors in considering promotion and tenure. The president shall take such student evaluations into account in making personnel recommendations to the Board, and the Board shall take such student evaluations into account in passing on such recommendations.

iii) Impartiality without the leadership necessary to provide the means to encourage academic excellence can produce nothing more than mediocrity. In restructuring college governance the following guidelines with respect to academic management should be followed:

IN THE SENIOR COLLEGES:

Each college should appoint an academic dean or dean of faculty who shall be granted the responsibility and authority, subject to the president, to function as the college's or school's chief academic officer charged with the presentation and development of the unit's academic excellence including but not limited to the recruitment, appointment, promotion and tenuring of the instructional staff. The importance to the faculty and the college of this position makes it imperative that the individual occupying the position of academic dean be acceptable to both the president and the faculty. Such appointments should be made by the president only with the advice and consultation of the faculty or an elected representative faculty body through the establishment of an appropriate search committee procedure. In addition each college, or each division and school within a college should establish a small academic review committee to review all appointment, promotion and tenure recommendations. The review committee should be chaired by the academic dean and its membership should be elected by the personnel and budget committee. Alternately, a majority of the members may be elected by the faculty with the rest chosen by the personnel and budget committee from among the departmental chairmen. It might be decided that for review purposes the academic review committee should replace the personnel and budget committee, or that it act as an additional review. In either case, the recommendations of the review committee should be made to the president and reported to the personnel and budget committee.

IN THE COMMUNITY COLLEGES:

In the community colleges teaching effectiveness and classroom performance should be an overriding consideration; these are also important in the senior colleges but there scholarship and professional standing play a more significant role. While the recommendations made above with respect to the senior colleges should also be implemented in the community colleges the overriding emphasis must be given to the development of means for the measurement and evaluation of teaching effectiveness and classroom performance. The community colleges are therefore directed - faculty, students and administration - to immediately begin studying means for the measurement and evaluation of classroom teaching performance. The suggestions contained in the paper "Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness in the Community Colleges." (Appendix) can be used as a starting point for such study.

The recommendations made above with respect to the community colleges have general applicability to the senior colleges as well. Those institutions should also develop means of implementing the type of suggestions contained in the Teaching Effectiveness Report, but in any event, should file with the Board a plan designed to accomplish similar ends.

(d) **The Students:** The student should be allowed the widest range of freedom of expression and inquiry to enable him to absorb from, as well as contribute to the educational process. The college exists for the preservation, development and transmission of knowledge and it is the students who enable these ends to be met.

i) Student activities are part of the educational process and take place within the context of the college community. These activities are primarily the students' contribution to the academic program and are a means of self-education. The students should have primary control and decision-making authority in these areas, but should tap the expertise of the faculty and administration when the need dictates.

ii) Because of the size and complexity of the student body, means of self-government must be devised which provide for the full representation of all segments of the student body and which can prevent the control of the decision-making bodies by a minority against the will of the majority.

iii) Since the administration of the college and the operation of the academic program directly affects the students and after graduation indirectly affects them as members of the geographical community, the decision-making process in these areas should provide for substantial student input to enable both to meet the needs of the students.

iv) The students are entitled to the full rights of any member of society and enjoy the protection of due process of law. With these rights go the corresponding duty to respect the rights of other members of the college community as well as the integrity of the community as a whole.

Conclusion

The college community should be reminded that the rights and responsibilities of the constituent groups in the community are in no sense absolute prerogatives. The President has the duty to act affirmatively for the good of the community where either the students or faculty have abused their rights or neglected their responsibility. In a similar manner the Chancellor and the Board have the duty so to act when the President is at fault.

The Board believes that the college community can meet the needs of its membership only if the individual members share a commitment to self-government, which provides for the widest expression of differing views within a framework of rationality and calm designed to prevent interference with the rights of the individual members of the community. The Board further believes that self-government can only be successful if each community is permitted the freedom to design its own structure within a basic framework of rights and responsibilities. The Board, therefore, directs that each college of the University be free to design a governance structure within the framework of this statement. This freedom carries with it the responsibility of each segment of the college community to actively pursue the aims set forth in the Board's statement on May 5, 1969 and, therefore, the Board now directs that each college present to the board for approval a plan for college governance no later than September 1971. Until such plans are approved by the Board, the colleges are to be governed by any governance plan now in effect and the present bylaws of the Board of Higher Education.

As a condition for submission of governance plans to the Board for approval, such plans shall have been approved by the President of the college and also approved by a majority of the students and faculty voting in an election held for the purpose of approving the plan, provided however, that at least 30% of each constituency votes in the election.

The Board's Committee on Governance shall have the responsibility for reviewing plans so submitted to insure compliance with this statement and shall also review existing plans and recommend changes necessary to conform them to the guidelines contained in this statement.

NOTE: Appendix, "Evaluating Teaching Effectiveness in the Community Colleges" is on file with these minutes in the Office of the Secretary of the Board.

Upon motion duly made, seconded and carried, the meeting adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

N. MICHAEL CARFORA
Secretary of the Board