Mr. Chairman, members of the University Senate, I have a deepest regret that I inform you of the resignation of Mr. Robert Remillard, Student Government Representative to the University Senate of Sacred Heart University. Mr. Remillard has informed me that due to very pressing problems in his personal life, he is forced to resign his position in both the Sacred Heart University Senate and the Sacred Heart University Student Government.

We, in the Sacred Heart University Student Government will deeply miss his active participation and greatly appreciate his efforts on behalf of the University and the Body of Sacred Heart University.

It is with profound reluctance that I ask to suspend the Student Governors of Sacred Heart University have decided that the absence created by the resignation of Mr. Remillard will be best served by an extra meeting of the Student Government. We would like to make clear that this decision was in no way a criticism for Mr. Remillard’s resignation. As previously stated, our main concern is that the resignation is due solely to personal reasons.

We feel that an explanation is necessary. The Student Government of Sacred Heart University has participated in the actions of the University Senate since its inception through the loyal participation of its representatives for the entire period of the University Senate’s existence. Our representatives have faithfully attempted to work for the betterment of the University Senate and the university community at large as a representative of the Student Government. Our representatives have worked diligently to fairly represent the feelings and desires of the Student Government of Sacred Heart University as the duly elected representative body of the Sacred Heart University Student Body. Unfortunately at this time, the Student Senate has been unable to act as agents of the University Senate throughout its entire history. The Student Senate, therefore, brings the Student Government to the reluctant conclusion that our representatives have participated in the actions of the body that has been either incapable or unwilling to act in the best interests of the student body. In point of fact, though the University Senate is a legally elected body it is not a legally elected governing body. Thus, citing the following evidence, the Student Senate hereby brings to your Student Government acting as agent for the Student Body of Sacred Heart University, the following: Sacred Heart University has achieved recognition as the governing legislative body of Sacred Heart University university. The University Senate restructures itself in a manner that is in fact representative of the University community and is in action, able and willing to act upon the pressing problems that now face the university. I respectfully refer you to the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee for Restructuring Sacred Heart University, dated December 5, 1969.

From this report all later versions of the University Senate constitution have been drawn. The original report from the Ad Hoc Committee reads in part, as follows:

Page 1, Section I, Para. E. of the original report reads as follows:

"The Board of Trustees recognizes the authority of a university Senate as a body made up of administrators, faculty members, and students to enact legislation whereby the University is governed in academic matters, faculty status, student affairs." The Ad Hoc Committee at the request of the Board of Trustees as stated in the memorandum from Mr. William B. Kennedy, dated December 5, 1969 changed the above paragraph to read as follows:

"Page 1, Section I, Para. B.: The Board of Trustees recognizes the authority of a university Senate made up of administrators, faculty members, and students to enact legislation whereby the University is governed in academic matters, faculty status, student affairs." The report of the Ad Hoc Committee, dated December 5, 1969 reflects the change requested by the Board of Trustees as recommended in the above cited memorandum.

Obviously, Ladies and Gentlemen, this meeting today is little more than an exercise in the fulfillment of a request made by the Board of Trustees. Mr. O’Connell said that he went over the document and approved the changes on the grounds that the act of incorporating (Special Act, No. 27) clearly places the legal responsibility for the management of the University in the hands of the Board of Trustees.

Finally, the original report reads, in Para. F. Section I, Page 1: "Recognizing the competence of the Senate in its enumerated powers, the Board of Trustees recognized the existence of a University Senate."

...the Senate has been violated," Mr. O’Connell said. "I would abide by the decisions of the Board of Trustees."

In point of fact, the University Senate has no legal responsibility for the management of the University. Without such an act of the Senate, the University was and is little more than an exercise in the fulfillment of a request made by the Board of Trustees.
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"Page 1, Section I, Para. B.: The Board of Trustees recognizes the authority of a university Senate made up of administrators, faculty members, and students to enact legislation whereby the University is governed in academic matters, faculty status, student affairs." This amendment, we submit, has the effect of destroying the supposed power that the University Senate has been acting with. In point of fact, the University Senate has no governing power and any thoughts to the contrary are nothing more than illusory.
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From The Editors

It is our opinion that the move by the Student Government to dissociate themselves with the Senate, until such time as the Senate re-appoints itself, was both necessary and important. The Senate can be and, be the powerful and viable organization on campus. The Senate should, if its existence is to be justified, be the sole authority in establishing and institutionalizing academic policies. (i.e. core requirements department structure, degree requirements etc.) We feel the people most competent in these areas are the faculty, students and administration. To leave the forming of academic policy in the hands of the businessmen of the Board of Trustees is an insane of an idea. We are leaving fighting for a Senate for this. This brings us back to the purpose of the Senate, and the original idea it was founded on. We ask the members of the Senate to look at themselves and really ask themselves what they're doing. Under your present structure, what can you do? This question was put forth by Senator Kolinski on April 28th when he asked, "What, if anything, can we (senators) do if the Board of Trustees refuses to listen to the people?"

There can't be. Just because the idea of the Senate is a good one does not mean that the Senate with its present structure is workable. Ideas don't make policy.

At this time, we would like to state that we are not against the Senate. We want the Senate; with stipulation. WE WANT A POWERFUL SENATE. WE WANT A MEANINGFUL SENATE. WE WANT A DAMN GOOD SENATE. The criticism of the Student Government is taken to heart and considered carefully, rather than rejected, out of pride, the above three desires will be met.

Again we point out, as in our last editorial, that we cannot answer these questions for you, nor do we intend to. It is your Senate and your school. For GOD'S sake Do Something—

Peace
Deli and Mark

Friday, March 17, 1972

OBELISK
Sacred Heart University
Bridgeport, Conn 06604

Letters to the Editor

To the Editor:

At the time of my election to the office of President of the Student Government, my foremost desire was to have a representative system within the University community and to strengthen the University. I never thought that my organization would ever find it necessary to resist in any extreme manner that is presented. Now, we are in the framework of the democratic process, at the moment. The Student Government was fully aware at the time that the decision was made to withdraw its support of the Senate that the meeting chosen for the announcement of this act could have been one of the most important meetings in the history of the Senate. We chose this meeting specifically because of its importance. Who has heard us if we had made this announcement at a Senate meeting held during the last semester? Who would have heard us. At the time of the shuffling? At a time when few people came to the Senate meetings at all, would have heard us? It is our observation that the student body is in greater disarray than ever before, with the Senate being forced to act with dispatch because it has not sought to do so in the past. With this observation in mind we acted.

Student Government stated in its policy statement delivered to the Senate that the Student Government will not replace its representative to the Senate until the question of re-appointment is dealt with. Student Government will not elect a representative (in fact, this will probably have been done by the time this is printed) but will place the election of the representative under the restriction that he or she not be present at Senate meetings until the question of re-appointment is dealt with. It is to be dealt with. As stated in our policy statement, the question is to be discussed. We feel that in its capacity to strengthen the Senate and make it the active body we know that it can be. We should not lose faith in the concept of the Senate and make clear that we have no intention of destroying the Senate or preventing its operation. We simply cannot participate any longer in the actions of the Senate as it is now constituted. I have received criticisms that the Student Government has failed in a misguided manner that cannot have a positive effect. We reject these criticisms. We fully appraised the possible effects of withdrawing our support before making the decision to deliver the statement. We stand by our decision then. We stand by it now.

Venceremos, President, SG

"America acts her craziness and you got to let go, you know!"

Paul Kantner

One thing we don't need is a wise ass. S. G. President

The Editors

To the Editor:

It seems to me that many of the students in this school are afraid of expressing their opinions about the Senate. First of all, the whole process of analyzing is not a matter of common sense. To think it is a matter of common sense makes a difference, and grammatical corrections are even more important. It is just that small point, but nevertheless it should be mentioned.

Disagreeing with different points of view on the business of a board is also certainly not a waste of time. You cannot pass any type of proposal without looking into it. Of course, all of this takes time, and the formation of committees and subcommittees is partially to take care of these details. Once it leaves the committee it goes on to the Senate for criticism and vote. Another point that should be mentioned is the fact that experience speaks for itself. It is true that the Senate may make mistakes, but who doesn't? I respect the Senators. I believe that we can learn from them. Perhaps if we spent less time criticizing and actually sat down and listened for a change, we may see how much responsibility there is in position of a Senator. The student Senators should be able to speak out on this. I have personally spoken to a few of them, and they agree that much work does go into the Senate.

I really would like to see how the students would solve the problems of this school if we had no type of governing body. I'm sure we would have ended up in the cemetery. Who has been doing all the work so far?—the Senate, because other members of SHU for whatever reasons, are not able to. I'm not talking about the small group of people that are planning to withdraw support.

Unusual when we have something that we want something else. We are never satisfied. That is the case in SHU. At first, SHU didn't have a Senate, but when it did, and it has done something for this school. At least it has done more than what the passive majority has done. Don't criticize if you are not ready to prove yourselves and to act upon that proof.

Good Luck Students!!

MJD

At least someone has an opinion!

Peace

Deli and Mark

The Editors

We the following student senators...

Justify our walkout on the University Senate today because we find it an overgrown body that does not equally represent all three factions of the university. we do not believe the Senate is useless. However, to make it more effective and viable we will return only when we can reapportion it to 5 students, 5 faculty, 3 administrators

continued on page 3
Subject: Minority Proposal on proposed curriculum revision

Minority Proposal

Area I
(9 credits; at least 2 disciplines)

- English Literature
- French
- German
- Italian
- Russian
- Spanish

Area II
(6 credits required)

- Applied Arts
- Humanities
- Physical Education

Area III
(9 credit hours required; at least 3 disciplines)

- Biology
- Chemistry
- Mathematics
- Physics
- Psychology
- Sociology

Extra! Extra!
Continued from Page 1

isan indeed disturbing to examine the minutes of the Senate, in which on an incredible delay. I refer you to the Minutes of the University Senate, pages 28 and 29, March 24, 1971.

Mr. Belli pointed out that the Senate convene as a committee of the whole to consider a proposed curriculum revision under the By-Laws. Mr. Belli pointed that this proposal is that that plan (or any other like it) will disastrously lower the proper minimum requirements of the groups of the University Senate but is not only that this is the present form of the Senate is not present to begin with. One wonders how long it will take for the Senate to act upon the act of the procedures of the Senate which are so critical to the institution as a whole. You will notice that I have made no mention of the problems faced by the Senate, nor do we have any evidence to the contrary. I submit that the Senate is in no way able to carry out the charge it has given.

We do not have any idea of what is their plan, or any other like it, which will have to be implemented in a very short time.

For example, it is not possible for less than 100 faculty members to be reduced by 100 students to be represented by 10. To be sure, we understand that the Senate wishes to hear requests for greater efficiency. But to think that the body that can act can certainly be so easily represented in a body in a body that can act.

At such time when this step is taken, the University Senate must be ready to act and if the student wishes to appeal for a different program or the Senate must be ready to act and if the student wishes to appeal for a different program or admission to the University Senate.

Below is the normal program of studies for Sacred Heart University students; however, the University subscribes to the notion that the individual student wishes to develop the expansion of the AA program might end the journey of the image of a University. A proper question, we feel. But one we feel should be posed to everyone to examine the effect of the acts of the Senate.

No one single act of the University Senate, we feel, is appreciably damaging to the image of a University. However, a long series of acts and deliberations and delays can appreciably damage the image and credibility of the Senate.

Lynn O'Donnell

Larry Jacobellis

G. Meyer

Regina C. Tarinilli

AnnMarie Super

Paul Dubinsky

Donald P. Memek Jr.

Paul D. Mereglio

Joseph A. D'Alessandro

Linda Lopez

Michael Gallagher

Dale DePoe

Jannine Maler

Edward Linard

Michael Somme

Joan Sciarra

Editorials cont'd

Of course this is not to say that all faculty members are mindless, thank some, foot in mouth, and so on. Occasionally I know of a dozen who give a damn and with little exaggeration the number is probably three dozen. We, the concerned students, have banded our heads against the long wall enough for you, listener, and it is about time we change the few interested students with working toward their own goals and to say the hell with working for the others.

For I can find no justification in those devoted students to continue killing themselves for creatures who don't care or don't want anything but whether or not their battle is ready on time and the milk just ready and, almost to a man, the majority of us recognize that we are not able.

There seems to be a need for more self-determination by the students who may wish to offer a 12-year curriculum. This is what we are trying to do and we have the mechanism for it. And to a lesser extent, Business Administration students to by-pass the foreign language requirements by substitution of another discipline.

It will at least discourage the mass shift from Liberal Arts to Business which has been anticipated in an area approach.

It does not deal with any particular department which might necessitate reduction of faculty or elimination of departments. It allows the Registrar a fighting chance to do the advanced planning of scheduling which is saved money. In our present financial situation, we should continue to make every effort to avoid such step.

7. It treats students as individuals, but does not treat them as individuals of different capacities.

An innovative while at the same time it will provide an area approach can then be used for future adjustments over the next several years.

Respectfully submitted,

Stephen J. Bennett

Ean Waugh
Czernota named to All American Team

Ed Czernota recently was selected 1971-72 College Division first team All-American by the National Association of Basketball Coaches (NABC).

The announcement was made by Ted Emery, Public Relations Director of the coaches' association and places Czernota among the nation's top players.

Tournament Thoughts

was paced by Bert Hammel who...