# C Capital T imes 

## Love that Studying



It's that time of year again.... Mid-Term Exams. Students can be seen all over campus with their noses buried in books and pen marks splayed across their faces.

## Students Prepared to Fight for Room <br> by Michele E. Hart

Seventy-five student members of clubs and organizations have signed a petition to let the faculty know that they want to continue to have the use of room 216.

And while the fate of a room may sound like a trivial issue-students in clubs and organizations said that room 216 serves as the nucleus for their activities.

The room, known as the Clubs Meetings Room, is included in a study being completed by the Task Force on Teaching Facilities appointed by Dr. Jerry South, associate provost for administrative operations, to find ways to improve common teaching facilities.

Janet Widoff, director of student activities, said, that to her knowledge, movian the clubs meeting roop is only a possibility at this time.

South said that there has been no discussion of the content of the task force's uncompleted proposal outside of the task force. He was unable to confirm or deny any rumors about the
study, or the possibility of assigning clubs and organizations a room in another location on campus.

SGA President Todd Hammaker said that if clubs are assigned to a room in any other building half of the student organizations will be eliminated because communication within the organizations will die.

Hammaker said that because of the location of the clubs room student organizations are better able to cooperate with each other.

Kay Trebatowski, SGA vice president said she also sees potential communication problems if the room is taken away from student organizations.
"I think the students need a central place to meet," she said.

In response to the possible loss of the room, the petition was circulated at the Student Leadership Conference and on campus to defend student use of the room.

Hammaker said he thinks that
See ROOM, page 2

## Faculty Reacts Strongly to Proposed Merger

By Kimberly Anastas
Faculty Council has declared its "strong opposition" to the way the administration has planned to merge the behavioral science/education and humanities divisions. Council also termed the reasons for the merger "unconvincing."

In a letter sent to top administration officials late last week, Council said the proposal did not follow the University Senate Guidelines for Reorganization, nor did it follow strategic planning, the university's process for long-range decision-making.

Betty Holmes, assistant professor of education, said the faculty puts many hours into strategic planning and the administration should follow the process too.
"When you start deviating from strategic planning, you start destroying the road map for the institution," said Robert Lesniak, associate professor of education.

Council said it is distressed that the faculty was not consulted before the merger was announced.
"No issue is closer to faculty concerns than the organization of the units in which they work," the letter said.

Commenting on the balance of power between the faculty and administration, Louise Hoffman, chairperson of the Faculty Council, said, "Graham is like the 500 -pound gorilla -he can sit anywhere he wants." Hoffman was referring to Associate Provost Robert Graham, who developed the merger plan.

In announcing the plan last month, Graham noted that university governance rules give the faculty power only to consult on the reorganization.

Grafiam has said the merger would help fundraising, improve interdisiplinary opdortunities, improve teacher preparation and better prepare the college for growth.

In its letter, the council said, "College leaders are already too much governed by financial incentives and too little attentive to academic excellence and professional balance and the needs of the campus."

Lesniak, a former dean of research, said, "no funding agency has ever said that the size of a division attracts funds."

He added that no data shows individual contributors would give more to a larger division. He said the faculty
requested such data and had not received it.

Lesniak said, "none of Graham's reasons seem to have any research base or empirical data ...."

The council acted at the suggestion of a six-member ad hoc faculty committee, which called itself the Committee for Academic Responsibility and Excellence (CARE).

Members of the committce included Lesniak, Holmes, Robert W. Colman, assistant professor of social science, Simon Bronner, associate professor of humanities, and James $F$. Rooney, associate professor of sociology.

The CARE memorandum stated: "There is no evidence that any type of research data was gathered or knowledgeable persons at our university or other institutions were contacted about the advisability of this reorganization."

When Graham introduced the plan on Jan. 21 he anticipated that students and faculty would object to the change.
"I feel tension when there's any suggestion of change," he said.

Colman of CARE said he too
was concerned that the faculty had no involvement in the decision to propose a merger.
"If you want a strong, involved faculty, you should consult them," he said.

Hoffman said the University Senate passed guidelines for divisional reorganization. According to these guidelines, the administration must define the proposal and its goals, list faculty consultations, describe relationships between the proposal change and other University programs and functions, indicate how tenure and promotion will be affected and indicate a timetable for the proposal.
"It's clear that process wasn't followed," Hoffuan said.

She noted, however, that Graham said the strategic plarning process provides guidelines only and can be disregarded.

She also said that she will meet with faculty senators to discuss possible action by the University Senate. She said that a faculty forum will be held on March 8 to discuss the situation further.

Other concerns of the faculty
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