

Vets circulate petition against cutback

By TOM AKIRE
Of the Emerald

Veterans on campus may feel an additional financial pinch if Congress approves a \$1.1 billion in the Veterans Administration's (VA) 1977 fiscal budget.

Gary Hargett, secretary of the Lane Community College (LCC) Veterans Association, said his group is circulating a petition urging Oregon legislators to vote against the proposed cutback.

One crucial area that would be affected by a budget cutback is the length of time a veteran would be eligible for VA educational benefits. Veterans can now claim benefits for 10 years after they leave military service, but according to Sen. Mark Hatfield, a tighter VA budget might result in reducing this figure to eight years.

This possible reduction comes at a time when the LCC veterans group is sponsoring another petition seeking to abolish any time limitations on veteran's educational benefits.

"Many vets need to return to school after 10 years from their discharge date," said Hargett. "They need additional job training or they have decided to prepare for another career."

A half-million vets across the nation will see the end of their benefits this May because of the 10 year limitation, said Hargett. "What we need is a longer time limit, not a shorter one," he added.

The proposed VA cutback may also spell an end to increases in the vet's cost of living allowance.

"Vets are already worse off today than they were after World War II," Hargett said. "If we were getting the same level of support those vets got, we'd be getting \$400 a month instead of the \$270 an unmarried vet now receives."

Copies of both petitions and more information are available at the LCC Veterans Association office, 747-4501, ext. 275.

State may split athletic funding

By TOM FLUHARTY
Of the Emerald

A proposal to fund all sports other than major revenue-producing sports from incidental fees and the state general fund will be discussed by the State Board of Higher Education at its Thursday meeting.

Drawn up by Roy Lieuallen, State System of Higher Education chancellor, the proposal would "...permit the major revenue-producing activities...to be self-supporting; and would encourage the use of student incidental fees and state general fund support to enable the 'other' athletic activities...to survive in the face of the raising cost of doing business."

The president of each of the state's universities would determine which sports produce revenue at his institution, subject to board agreement. Basketball and football are usually money-makers.

According to the proposal, these sports will be "fully self-supporting from gate receipts, television and radio income, conference income and contributions. Any incidental fees used to support major revenue-producing athletic activities will be assumed to be for the purpose of buying student tickets."

If the proposal is adopted, minor sports will be "financed from student incidental fees, gate receipts, contributions and state funds appropriated for education and general purposes." Salaries for administrators and minor sports coaches, as well as physical plant costs, will be taken out of state funds.

Lieuallen recommends in the proposal that "additional state support should be sought to offset the proposed added burden on the Education and General Service budget."

Senate considers EOC proposals

The University Senate will consider two more Educational Opportunity Committee (EOC) motions when they convene today at 3:30 p.m. in 229 Law.

The EOC recently concluded a six-month review of University Pres. Boyd's restructuring of the minority services in August, and made three proposals to deal with the situation.

One proposal requests the Senate to appoint a sub-committee to investigate the alleged misuse of delegated authority by three offices. Another calls for a policy defining University commitment to culturally, racially, ethnically disadvantaged students. The third proposal involves recommendations on the University's educational mission in connection with minority disadvantaged students.

Otherwise the added burden would need to be accommodated either by an increase in tuition or by a reduction in the resources available for other education and general programs. Neither of these latter alternatives is recommended."

This is one of the areas that causes concern for ASUO Pres. Jim Bernau. He plans to testify against the proposal at Thursday's meeting.

He said that since money will be coming from general funds, it is possible that the Legislature will tie tuition increases to the money. He also said he believes academics will be affected by having to stretch the money in the fund to cover both academics and athletics. The University should "shore up" its academics rather than its athletics, he remarked.

Bernau also said that he does not believe it is a sincere effort to help minor sports, but an effort to "free up" major sports, since

they would no longer have to support the minor athletic activities. This means more revenue for major sports and no check upon the use of these funds. That money can be used to "fatten the budgets," Bernau said.

"What makes me uncomfortable is the unbridled growth of revenues that won't serve our academic purpose," he said.

Lieuallen said the major sports would have no freedom to operate any differently and would still be responsible to the athletic director, who reports to the president's office.

Bernau is also against the proposal because it does not fulfill the equal opportunity requirements of Title IX. He said the ASUO would not support the proposal unless it provides for equal opportunity in all ways.

Lieuallen said the proposal is not an attempt to provide a solution to Title IX, but is designed to permit a solution.

State board

(Continued from Page 1)

tion, although they do have some suggestions regarding the wording of some of those rules. The two groups testified earlier before the board to get them to adopt more affirmative rules than the ones proposed in December and February. When the rules passed the board unanimously, the caucus and the ASUO brought it to the attention of the Legislative Council Committee.

After taking testimony regarding the board's actions, the committee ruled that "the higher education rules on discrimination did not comply with the intent of the law, because the rules were inadequate." They also claimed that the grievance procedures described in the rules were of an "intimidating nature."

Since the committee's rulings were recommendations, the board was not actually required to revamp its rules. But during the past month, the board's staff has drawn up rules concerning discrimination in housing, employment, financial aid, recruitment and athletics. In addition, the rules provide for a compliance officer "who shall be responsible directly to the Chancellor." One of the complaints regarding the original rules was that the compliance officer for each institution would be an administrator within that institution.

To alleviate student "intimidation," the recommendations call for a grievance counselor "to assist students and others in formulating and following up complaints of alleged prohibited discrimination."

While the ASUO is pleased with the recommended discrimination rules, they are less than happy with the staff recommendations regarding their tenure and promotion proposal. The rules presently allow for "ap-

propriate student input," but do not specifically define what that input should be. The ASUO is requesting solicited letters, student evaluations of instructors (already enforced at the University), and the "appointment of students to serve on personnel committees" as means of obtaining that input. The board's staff strongly rejected the proposal, claiming the avenues for input should be left up to each institution.

The tenure and promotion proposal also puts instruction as the first criterion in evaluating faculty performance, unless, according to ASUO Pres. Jim Bernau, "that faculty member's main function is to conduct research." The staff did allow "post-tenured review" to be evaluated by the University, but Bernau said that was the least important part of the ASUO proposal.

The staff recommendations to the Finance Committee call for no tuition increases for either resident or non-resident undergraduate or graduate. Bernau calls this proposal "a hollow promise. They say no tuition increases, so they can get us to lobby for their budget. When the Legislature gives higher education all they can, the students make up what's left in tuition increases." He said that any tuition recommendations the board makes now can be rescinded if the financial situation calls for increased tuition.

Bernau says he plans to fight for increased financial aid to reduce students' costs. He also thinks tuition can realistically be frozen "if the board submits an efficient budget to the Legislature." He says that budget request does not have to be reduced to be efficient, but that every dollar of it should be justified."



The Popular Movement for the Liberation of Oregon enjoins all dedicated fighters for independence to participate in the PMLO's post-insurgency administrative arm, the Provisional Government. The following portfolios are available:

Chancellor of the Interior

Controller General

Defense Minister

Viceroy of Northern California

Interested patriots with the requisite experience and courage should submit resumes and certified Oregon birth certificates to: Robert Liverty, Acting General Secretary, Provisional Government of the Republic of Oregon, Waynflete Building, The Plain, Oxford OX1 4AU, United Kingdom. Applicants should understand that working conditions are hazardous and remuneration is impossible.

(Persons of Californian birth are not excluded, but must provide the names and addresses of 25 Oregonians willing to testify to their loyalty.)

SECESSION NOW!

Paid for by Robert Liverty on behalf of the

POPULAR MOVEMENT FOR THE LIBERATION OF OREGON