The Student Relationships Committee met six times between October 19, 1967, and April 1, 1968. During this period its actions touched on:

1. Faculty participation in the University's Homecoming program.
2. Freshman Orientation.
3. The Academic Evaluation.
4. Student Participation in Dean's Council Disciplinary Actions.
5. Alterations in the Penalty for Academic Dishonesty.
6. Replacement of the Committee itself by the establishment of a Joint Committee of the Senate and the Student Council.

Committee actions (as numbered above) are described more fully:

1. HOMECOMING: The Committee on October 19 unanimously endorsed "full faculty support" of the November 3-5 Homecoming activities. The Committee urged the student chairman of the Homecoming program to seek the immediate cooperation of departmental chairman. For the future the Homecoming committee was urged to move earlier to specify and secure support for the type of faculty participation it desired.

2. ORIENTATION: The Committee's recommendation of October 19 that a "professional administrator" be appointed to coordinate Freshman Orientation was favorably received. Director of Student Services William Smith subsequently appointed Miss Lianna Larabee as Orientation Coordinator. Miss Larabee described her new role to the Committee at its January 29 meeting. At Miss Larabee's request the chair appointed a permanent subcommittee to assist and advise her.

3. ACADEMIC EVALUATION: In conference with Stephen Selzer and later Marshal Worden the Committee carefully reviewed every question which later appeared in the evaluation questionnaire for 1967-68. It recommended deletions, additions, and alterations, virtually all of which were accepted by the Student Council's Evaluation Committee. These "drafting" sessions were marked by a sustained spirit of harmony and goodwill.

The Committee's rationale for cooperating in an enterprise which some faculty have found odious is as follows: (1) that the Student Council cannot and should not be dissuaded from publishing an evaluation of courses and professorial performance; (2) that previous evaluations have, in some instances, caused serious and unnecessary damage to faculty-student relations, and (3) that the Committee believes that its suggestions can prevent such damage in the future.

Concurrently, the Committee sought to regularize the sampling of student opinion by resolving unanimously:
"That Faculty members who wish to cooperate with the Evaluation allow ten minutes of class time for the distribution and completion of the questionnaires."

Because this resolution was later criticized on the floor of the Senate, the Committee offers the following explanation:

1. Faculty prerogative was protected by directing the request for ten minutes of class time to those faculty members "who wish to cooperate."

2. Ten minutes was considered a reasonable time period, a consideration based on experimental answering of the questionnaire.

3. Alternative methods of sampling, e.g. by "ballot-box" returns or by putting the evaluation procedure in the hands of small committees, had been tried and found unreliable.

4. STUDENT PARTICIPATION IN DEAN'S COUNCIL DISCIPLINARY ACTION:

Professor Robert Jones introduced and the Committee, during meetings on November 15 and 27, unanimously approved a resolution, part of which was adopted by the Senate on December 8.

That part of the resolution which the Senate adopted read:

"That the President of the Student Body, with the advice and consent of the respective Dean's Councils, appoint one student ... to become a full participant with voting privileges in the deliberations of each of the Dean's Councils of the University in each case where a student charged with academic dishonesty elects to have student participation in the judgment of his case. Students will be informed of their right to have such student participation in the letter of announcement of the meeting."

Although the Senate adopted this part of the Committee's resolution, it rejected a second paragraph which would have provided for the same sort of student participation when a dean's council heard an appeal from a student who had been suspended for academic deficiency.

In pursuance of that part of the resolution which was adopted, the President of Student Body has already appointed qualified students to the Dean's Councils of the Columbian College (Upper) and the School of Public and International Affairs. Other appointments to the Dean's Councils of other schools will be made before the end of the spring semester, 1968.

5. ALTERATIONS IN THE PENALTY FOR ACADEMIC DISHONESTY:

Professor Robert Jones introduced and the Committee, during meetings on November 15 and 27, unanimously approved a resolution reducing the penalty for academic dishonesty. The Senate adopted this resolution on December 8. As amended on the floor, it read:
"That the penalty for academic dishonesty (page 34 of the current catalog) be amended to read as follows:

"Academic dishonesty on the part of any student will result in a disciplinary grade of F for the course involved and also may, upon the recommendation of the appropriate dean's council, result in his suspension from the University for a stated period, at the end of which time he may petition for readmission. The disciplinary grade of 'Failure--Academic Dishonesty' will be recorded for the course involved, and this grade will be employed in the computation of the quality point index. A student so suspended shall be withdrawn from all other courses except those in which all work has been completed."

The Committee felt that the original penalty--the grade of F in all courses for that semester--was so severe as to deter some professors from bringing charges to the Dean's Councils, and that the Councils were often reluctant to follow the letter of the law. Moreover, the assignment of F in all courses for the semester resulted in an undesirable administrative alteration of grades assigned by professors in courses in which academic dishonesty did not occur.

6. ESTABLISHMENT OF A JOINT COMMITTEE OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE AND THE STUDENT COUNCIL:

This proposal grew out of President Elliott's wish to abolish the University Committee on Student Life, and the resultant problem of transferring that committee's functions to other organs of the University.

Finding a place for the SLC advisory function caused the greatest difficulty. Separately and then jointly the Senate Student Relationships Committee and the University Student Life Committee wrestled with this problem of where to vest the advisory functions of the latter.

Various alternatives were considered:

1. Student Council alone might hereafter advise the President directly on matters relating to student life. This proposal had strong support in committee and later on the floor of the Senate. It seemed to eliminate the need for an intermediary committee and at the same time strengthen the hand of Student Government. This alternative was not proposed by the Senate Committee, however, because it seemed to leave open the possibility of rivalry between Senate and Student Council. To put the President to the choice of unresolved or conflicting advice from these two sources was deemed not to be in the best interests of student-faculty relations or University harmony.

2. Senate Student Relationships Committee might absorb the Student Life Committee's advisory function. One argument against this proposal was that it seemed to subordinate student matters to faculty regulation. The Senate Committee felt that even if its own membership were reconstituted to
admit of equal student-faculty representation, and even if its authority in purely student matters were made terminal, the Committee would remain a committee of the Senate. In that subordinate role the Committee might be unable to prevent matters primarily of student concern from being resolved by the parent faculty body. The Committee, in fact, defeated a motion by which it would have accepted the advisory function of the Student Life Committee, even though that motion contained the safeguards mentioned above.

Having discarded these alternatives, the Senate Committee and the University Committee unanimously endorsed a proposal to establish a Permanent Joint Committee of the Senate and Student Council. This Joint Committee would assume the advisory powers of the Student Life Committee. It would be tied firmly to both parent bodies by providing (1) voting membership in the Senate to the President of Student Body and to the student chairman or student vice-chairman of the Joint Committee; and (2) voting membership in the Student Council to the Chairman of the Senate Executive Committee and to the faculty chairman or faculty vice-chairman of the Joint Committee.

The Joint Committee Resolution (Sen. Res. 67/10) received the unanimous endorsement of the Student Council.

At a special meeting on March 20 the Senate adopted a series of amendments to Draft Resolution 67/10. While giving its approval in substance to this Joint Committee proposal (subject to implementing alterations in the organic laws of both faculty and student bodies), the Senate made four significant changes in the Committee's draft:

1. The Senate rejected that part of 67/10 which would have provided dual membership for two students and two faculty persons.

2. The Senate added a paragraph by which it would have required the Joint Committee to consider any matter which it might refer to the Committee and to report to the Senate on that matter. This addition restricted that part of the draft resolution which gave the Joint Committee relative autonomy in deciding what matters "are of import only to the Student Body" and thereafter directing its advice as it saw fit.

3. The Senate varied part of the general charge to the proposed Joint Committee. Whereas in draft the resolution charged the Committee "to encourage full and responsible student participation in all areas of Senate policy-formulation which affect student life," the amended version charged the Committee "to encourage student recommendations in all areas of Senate policy-formulation which affect student life."
4. Also by amendment the Senate provided that student members of the Joint Committee might have the privilege of the Senate floor whenever the Senate considered a matter coming from the Joint Committee.

The Senate's amended version of Resolution 67/10 was put to the Student Council on March 27. There an answering resolution was introduced and tabled. The Council's resolution, together with the Council's subsequent action thereon, is appended to this Annual Report.

The Senate Student Relationships Committee met on April 1, to consider, amend, and approve this Report.
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Peter Hill, Chairman
Jay Bomze
T. H. Hohman
Lillien Hamilton
Robert G. Jones
Robert Kenny
James Knicely, ex officio
George Koehl
Steven Korcheck
Barton Loring
John Morgan
Stephen Remsberg
Marianne Phelps
Nan B. Smith
William P. Smith
Helen Yakobson
Appendix to the Annual Report of the Standing Committee on Student Relationships of the University Senate

Whereas, the Student Council, the Student Life Committee, and the University Senate Committee on Student Relationships unanimously approved the establishment of a Joint Senate-Council Committee which would take on the advisory functions of the Student Life Committee; and,

Whereas, the purpose of this committee was to increase communication and cooperation between the Student Council and the University Senate and to encourage greater student participation in molding basic policies affecting all aspects of the University; and,

Whereas, the resolution recognizes this principle by membership of two Council members on the University Senate and two Senate members on the Student Council; and,

Whereas, the University Senate in its resolution of March 20th does not recognize this student participation on matters before the University Senate; therefore:

Be it Resolved by the Student Council of the George Washington University that:

A. Resolution (67/10) as amended and passed by the University Senate be rejected as unacceptable to the student interest.

B. The judicial function of the Student Life Committee be vested in a Supreme Court of Student Appeals pursuant to the amendments to the Constitution of the Student Life Committee introduced by Jim Knicely and Alan May now pending before that body.

C. The Student Life Committee be reconstituted, reappointed and continued to advise the President of the University in molding basic policies affecting all aspects of the University and to guarantee students a formally structured means of access to Presidential policy-making.

D. Further steps be taken with students and faculty conferring and attempting to integrate the power structure of the University so that the interests of all parties can be represented.

(The foregoing resolution was lifted from the table and passed 24-3, at the meeting of the Student Council on April 3, 1968.)