



The OREGON DAILY EMERALD published Monday through Friday during the college year except Oct. 30; Dec. 5 through Jan. 3; Mar. 6 through 28; May 7; Nov. 22 through 27; and after May 24, with issues on Nov. 4 and May 12, by the Associated Students of the University of Oregon. Entered as second class matter at the postoffice, Eugene, Oregon. Subscription rates: \$5 per school year; \$2 per term.

Opinions expressed on the editorial page are those of the writer and do not pretend to represent the opinions of the ASUO or of the University. Initialed editorials are written by the associate editors. Unsigned editorials are written by the editor.

A Day for Diplomacy

Oregon students now have a chance to prove ourselves something more than the immature kids which events of recent years have tabbed us. Diplomacy will have its day if we'll give it the opportunity.

This "chance" is a 20-page report which has been tabbed the "Oregon report." It comes from a committee of nine students appointed by the ASUO president to investigate dormitory conditions.

In a nutshell, the report suggests separate living units for freshmen, pledging deferred until winter term for men and women, a counseling and sponsoring program under the Office of Student Affairs and the ASUO Cabinet, and some new twists in freshman orientation.

Controversy over the committee and its report has been most heated on this page. Much less bitter was the receipt of the report by at least one all-campus group, Heads of Houses.

These presidents of women's living organizations discussed the suggestions in a very fair and rational manner, bringing up questions pertinent to the program. Similar reaction has been reported from Interfraternity Council and Interdormitory Council, men's house presidents.

Now, if alumni, especially those eternal sophomores, will just look before they leap into this report and its suggestions . . . if students will continue to do themselves proud . . . and if administration leaders will join in as they have been doing . . . this dormitory report will serve as a foundation upon which all groups concerned can build a satisfactory freshman living program.

Permit us to reprint part of the introduction to the report: "The committee does not at this time pretend to have solved all the difficulties involved in starting such a plan as is here recommended at Oregon. But it does believe that the suggestions in this report have merit and are worthy of the deepest possible consideration by the student body and the administration, with action toward establishing such a program the contemplated end."

Put Up or Shut Up

Today both AGS and USA will elect a slate of candidates for student body and class offices. The people elected by these parties will vie for the administration of Student Government next year.

It's not new—it's done every year, but How is it done every year? Some say it's done by relatively few members in each party—the politicians—the wheels.

Others are more generous—they say it's done by the few really interested students. The out and out optimistic ones say it's done by the student body out of interest for the promotion of better student government on the campus.

Today we find out.

AGS representatives will elect the final members for the party slate at 4 p.m. today. Tomorrow by noon persons recommended by the party will be known by members of all AGS houses. If the optimist is right, the majority opinion of each house concerning preference of candidates will be revealed by the election.

And whose responsibility is that? The responsibility of each member of each house to make his opinions known to his representative—or the optimist is lost in the shuffle—again.

USA will have the huge and necessarily slow process of electing a slate at 4 p.m. According to the optimist, every member interested in the welfare of student government should attend that meeting and indicate his preference by ballot. A better opportunity couldn't be provided. If students don't respond—the pessimist is right—again.

Every year we hear complaints about imbecility, juvenile nature, lack of ability, and so on, shown by students connected with student government.

Actually students are griping about their own mistakes—either in judgment or participation. It isn't necessary at all. Maybe we need more interested optimists.—J.P.

THE DAILY 'E' . . .

To the ingenious islanders of Minturn Hall and their method for keeping things cool. How about a method for treating campus atmosphere these days?

THE OREGON LEMON . . .

to those students who trample the new grass around the Student Union.

Judge and be Judged

THE FACULTY HAS GPA TOO

Grades are not for students alone—your University faculty gets them, too.

Each year administrative officers submit staff grades or ratings to the president along with recommendations for promotions, changes in rank, termination of services, and static service.

As compared to students who are rated A to F, the professional staff is judged on a numerical basis, from 1 to 5. Grades of 1 are tantamount to A, with the ratings continuing on a graduated scale.

Salary, length of service, age, and present tenure have no part in determining these ratings. Instead, they are based on three distinct lines of activity:

(1) Productive scholarship (such as research, authorship of books, talks before educators, etc.)

(2) Teaching ability (including methodology of examinations, classroom work, preparation, and any advisory activities in which the instructor may participate as part of his regular assignment.

Service Rating Included

(3) General service to the University and state (embracing contributions other than those in the area of instruction, such as activities in connection with national organizations and committees.)

Of the three categories, the first two are considered the most important, according to President Newburn. Composite, ratings are given to include all three of the categories.

A rating of 1 indicates outstanding performance in the given lines of activity. Since it is the highest possible grade that may be achieved, few are given; in certain schools and departments there may be no academic staff member who attains this standard of competence.

A 2 denotes performance "clearly above average"; 3 is "above average"; 4 is "definitely below average"; and 5 is "definitely poor."

The Inside Story

Your University faculty members spend many of their waking hours issuing term grade reports on their students.

But how about the grades they receive themselves? The Daily Emerald set out to find the "inside" of how the faculty family is rated on this campus. Among the faculty, these ratings may be just as important as grades are to students.

The answers are provided in the accompanying article, based on an interview with President H. K. Newburn by Associate Editor Tom King.

The faculty is rated entirely on the basis of merit, without regard for the position held or the stipend drawn. Under this system the only members of the staff who do not receive grades are graduate and research assistants.

In addition to the grade, information and supporting data are supplied by the dean. A professor, then, is graded—and this is supplemented by material telling why and how the grade has been arrived at.

A special advisory council selected by the faculty also makes available ratings and information for the president. This council grades those members of the faculty about whom there is sufficient information available to

make a judgment. In the event that there are large-scale discrepancies between the ratings given by a dean and by the council, Newburn will arrange a special meeting to attempt to consolidate the two viewpoints. The council also makes advisory suggestions for tenure, promotions, and other staff changes.

Ratings are distinguished from promotions, salary adjustments, and other such intra-University matters. The deans submit ratings concurrently with their recommendations for promotions and other changes.

Annual Basis at First

As the University presently operates, professors are at first employed on an annual basis. After a three-year period the University is obligated to make a review to determine whether or not a member of the faculty should be recommended for indefinite tenure.

Seven Year Maximum

Yearly reappointments may be made for a maximum number of seven years. At that time, the professor must either be put on tenure or dropped from the staff.

In this connection, the normal retirement age for professors is fixed at 65 by the state.

Letters

The Campus Answers

Corsage to Counselors

Emerald Editor:

It seems possible that the new living and counseling program suggested by the Stanford Committee has, by implication, cast a few adverse reflections on the present counseling group. This group certainly deserves no such criticism.

The committee did not mean to make any such implication but perhaps it has been done. I would like to clear the atmosphere a little on this point.

One of the counselors was heard to remark bitterly:

"It looks like they consider our whole program a flop."

No, Mr. Counselor, those of us who have been closely associated with this year's counseling program can nominate much more worthy candidates for a 'flop' title.

We might mention the higher echelon of the administration and suggest they could do with a better structured organization—where lines of authority were more clearly drawn in the Office of Student Affairs in respect to a counselor's duties.

We might nominate Interfraternity Council because many houses in IFC have tended to regard the counseling group as a deadly foe. This attitude has leaked over onto a number of the freshmen pledges, we might add.

Or we might nominate Interdormitory Council as the group who allowed a somewhat shaky first-year situation to become even more shaky as the bars to contain group living were torn down and thrown away.

We could even nominate a number of upper class dorm men who have resented any attempt to become 'assistant sponsors', and help the counselor in a job that was practically a full-time occupation.

And if we wanted to drop down to the personality level, we might even point a finger at the writer of this letter, one Bill Clothier.

I feel that one of the biggest mistakes made by any group was the IDC-IFC compromise last year. I was instrumental in obtaining this 'gentleman's agreement'.

This piece of paper served as the first gun in an opening barrage that practically shot the

counselor's ship right out from under him. The amazing thing is that any sort of success was scored at all. And that it was scored is made manifest by the extremely high grades attained by the university as a whole.

If there are any bouquets to be handed out, Mr. Kline and his counselors should get the first one. There are a lot of other places where the brick-bats are more justified.

Bill Clothier

It Could Be Oregon



"Oh! I don't mind not having paper—it helps my memory if I just write on anything."