

THE WITANY GUB

NEWS AND NOTES EXTRA

STATE BOARD HEARINGS CONTINUE

by Christine Schramm

UNIVERSITY PARK (APS)—The State Board of Education brought to life again the touchy Heald-Hobson report in public hearings which began Sept. 20 in Erie, and continued during the following weeks in Bethlehem and Philadelphia.

The report, a study of the Commonwealth Campus system, was ordered by the Board last spring to determine the system's effectiveness and was compiled by Heald-Hobson, Associates, independent educational consultants.

When the report was released it caused concern among state educators and residents because it recommended the closing of some Commonwealth Campuses, and the conversion of others into community colleges.

Kenneth L. Holderman, director of Commonwealth Campuses, said in an interview last month that while the report was interesting, there is no need for anyone to become unnecessarily alarmed about it.

Holderman explained that the State Board of Education was set up six years ago by the State legislature to establish a master plan for higher education in the State, and to review requests from the State's colleges and make recommendation to the legislature and governor on the requests.

Holderman said that the Board has no actual control over the University, that it is the University's Board of Trustees that is responsible to the Governor and the legislature.

Therefore, in ordering the report, the Board was actually entering an area in which it had no concern, and ordered a study on which it could take no action. The round of hearings may be an attempt on the part of the Board of Education to cover up the fact that it "stuck its neck out," so to speak, in ordering the report.

The Board appeared to get what it paid for though, since Heald-Hobson knew before hand that the Board of Education favored community colleges and would like to have more control over the University system.

This could be one reason why the report recommended "mission assignment" and the closing of some Commonwealth Campuses, and the conversion of others to community colleges.

"Unfortunately, this is the news that received the publicity when the report was released," Holderman lamented. But he went on to say that there were other findings made by Heald-Hobson that were quite favorable to the University, although these never received much publicity.

These included such items as the effectiveness of the University for the money spent. Studies show that the Commonwealth

continued p. 2

FACULTY SENATE COMMITTEE PASSES NEW RULINGS

UNIVERSITY PARK (APS)—The Faculty Senate Committee on Undergraduate Student Affairs has passed two new rulings. One allows students to have an adviser with them at all disciplinary meetings, and the other abolishes the practice of barring students on disciplinary probation from taking part in extracurricular activities.

In the first ruling, students now called before Administration officials for disciplinary action have the right to be accompanied by an adviser of his choice, as a result of the passage of the "Witness Bill."

The new ruling also applies to meetings with the student court, the campus patrol and the campus security.

The bill allows the student to by-pass counseling meetings and go directly to the disciplinary meetings. The counseling sessions are held to advise the student of his rights.

Parsons calling and attending the counseling meetings cannot take any disciplinary action, so the student is not permitted to bring an adviser.

There was some debate on whether or not the student should be allowed to by-pass the counseling session.

Proponents of the bill felt that in the past the student have been pre-judged guilty during these counseling meetings and that by pre-supposition of guilt can be avoided.

In answer to a question brought up by one of the senators, Lawrence H. Lattman, chairman of the committee, said that the student can refuse to meet with the (University Park) campus patrol of security department until he has an adviser with him.

Lattman said that this was done because the patrol is sometimes more interested in gathering evidence than in the student's procedural rights.

Also provided for in the bill is the right of the student to call on his behalf a reasonable number of witnesses and to cross-examine all accusers "who can reasonably be expected to attend the (disciplinary) meeting."

Under the new bill, the student must be notified in advance of the charges being brought against him, so he may have sufficient time to prepare a defense.

The bill also states that the burden of proof-of-guilt lies with the person[s] bringing the charges.

As in the past, students may have the case taken directly to the Dean of Student Affairs, instead of the student court.

The student may also appeal the case to the Dean of Student Affairs after it has been heard and acted on by the student court.

While an appeal is being made, no disciplinary action can be taken against the student.

continued p. 2