

Passage essential

Last Thursday a committee of the State Board of Higher Education "reluctantly" passed twelve pages of explicit rules forbidding discrimination in colleges and universities in Oregon. This reluctance threatens higher education in two ways. For one, these rules are essential in insuring students a fair education, so they must be upheld by the full board next month. Even more frightening, however, is that board "reluctance" may bring legislative reprisal which could threaten the autonomy of the State System of Higher Education.

The rules passed Thursday were the third different set of discrimination rules, required by a 1975 Oregon law, which the committee will recommend to the board. In November the committee tried to get skimpy, generalized rules and an unfair grievance procedure passed, but an outcry by the ASUO, the Women's Political Caucus and a number of legislators persuaded the board to send the rules back to the committee. A month later, the board passed similar rules containing a few minor changes.

A subsequent review by the Legislative Council Committee found the board's rules "inadequate" and their grievance procedure "intimidating" to students. The legislators' meaning in that decision was clear, but it became even more so when the Council Committee formed a two-member subcommittee to watch over the state board, making sure it complied with the intent of the law in eliminating discrimination.

The board has to avoid such legislative reprisal if it is going to maintain its power, and even more importantly, its separation from the legislature. The board serves as an advocate for higher education's budget before a legislature which itself is "reluctant" in funding the state system. With a powerful board which is autonomous from government, that legislature is kept from chipping away at higher education's budget.

The State Board of Higher Education starts losing its power and autonomy when the legislature establishes committees to monitor the board's performance. The legislature's distrust of the board was already shown during the last session, when the state transformed the Educational Coordinating Commission into an even bigger and more powerful watchdog.

If the board continues to drag its feet in conforming to state law, it could bring further legislative action which could threaten the board's power, and consequently, higher education in Oregon.

OF ANGELES TIMES SYNDICATE
CARTOON BY
CARTOON



opinion

Negotiations at standstill

For the past two months five students representing the UO Student Employees Union, Local 1893, AFSCME, have been negotiating with University administrators for a contract covering student food service employees in the EMU and housing department. Dealing with the UO's bureaucrats has never been easy and this time has been no exception. Negotiations finally came to a standstill last week and a state mediator has been called in. Six major issues are unresolved.

Wages: The University of Oregon has offered a two per cent increase over two years, just enough to keep wages over minimum wage. Allen McKenzie, assistant vice-chancellor of the state board and the UO's chief negotiator, believes the current wage of \$2.22 is high and says that without minimum wage the state would be offering even less (*Oregon Daily Emerald* 4-13-76).

McKenzie also states in the *Emerald* article that their offer is consistent with wages the state has offered previously. This is untrue. Previously, the state said their offer was based on their policy of paying students 85 per cent of civil service wages. That was fine for them last year when that amounted to two cents above minimum wage. This year is a different story since they would be offering us a starting wage of \$2.48 under their old policy.

The union has asked for a 15.5 per cent increase (starting wage of \$2.56), premium pay for weekends and a voluntary health insurance plan. Student food service workers are some of the lowest paid employees on campus. Faculty will soon receive a 10 per cent increase and on July 1, civil service will receive a 12 per cent increase. Student wages have never kept up with inflation and the difference between civil service and student wages for identical work has grown increasingly larger.

Grievance Procedure: The union offered an entirely new grievance procedure which we believed fair to both sides. McKenzie's counterproposal was a procedure which required personal damage before action could be taken. In other words you have to break your leg to complain about a slippery floor.

Training: the union offered a six-point proposal on training. Section one states that in principle, all employees would be trained for jobs on an assigned shift. Section two states that a new employee shall be trained within the first 20 hours on the job. It and section three further require that a student training another student after this 20 hour period or training a civil service employee shall be paid time-and-one-half. Section four says that if fewer than four fifths of a shift is fully trained the

entire shift will get time-and-one-half. Section four is not a vital proposal to the union. Sections five and six say that the employer will give each employee written job descriptions and will post written instructions to all machines.

The UO agreed to write job descriptions but not to provide them to employees. In addition, they would not agree to state in principle that all employees should be fully trained.

Safety: The union proposed that all safety questions must be cleared up within seven days. The state countered with a proposal that an employee could 1) bring a safety problem to their attention, 2) wait 30 days, 3) if no correction is made and the employee has by that time broken their leg on the slippery floors, they can file a grievance. My advice to the employee would be to sue.

Fair-Share Election: Fair-share means that all employees must pay our terribly high dues of a dollar a month. We are not even asking for that. We are asking for an election to determine if the employees desire fair-share.

Length of Agreement: The state has been complaining loudly that they are tired of negotiating every year (since last year that is). They are asking a multiple year contract. However, as long as they refuse to have a fair and reasonable contract, we will insist the contracts last a very short time.

These negotiations have never gone well. After the University stalled at starting negotiations for two months, we had to file an Unfair Labor Practice Complaint before they would meet. At negotiations, we proposed a comprehensive rewrite of the contract, at which the University balked. They might, after all, have to make some concessions that they didn't last year.

The actions of McKenzie and Jack W. Steward, the UO's director of personnel, in negotiations have been very threatening and very close to unethical. There is some hope that to a mediator the University may be more reasonable. The only way to show that we mean what we say is to get more members. We had 84 in March and signed up 20 more last week and we represent between 200 to 250 employees. The more members we have, the more effectively we can deal with the state. To join or for information please contact Allison Petigura (484-1048), myself (343-7870), Bill Frye (x5339) in Hamilton or E.A. Goodwin (x4320) in Carson.

Jack Condliffe
vice-president, UO Student
Employees Union

Letters

Band together

I was surprised at the lack of coverage of the karate tournament held Saturday at Mac Court. While there was a track meet that same afternoon and a choice between the two events may have been difficult, those who did not attend the karate tournament missed some fine performances. Both the daytime and evening matches were worth seeing and, for the most part, the entire evening program of demonstrations and competition was interesting and enjoyable.

Part of the evening, however, was far from enjoyable. I address my concerns about it to everyone involved in martial arts and especially to women in the martial arts.

I found the announcer for the evening extremely irritating. He not only appeared to be somewhat disorganized at times, he continually made slurs over the PA system about the women who were competing. The word "women" was never used by him — he used either "you girls," "the girls," or "the ladies." He frequently interjected remarks such as "The ladies seem a bit confused!" "We've got a couple of

scrappers here tonight!" "Here we go again!" The written word does not convey the snickering tone with which these were said.

I noticed that during other parts of the meet, similar situations among "the boys" did not bring similar remarks. The male participants were treated as individuals, not as curious specimens of "the boys." They were treated with respect.

I hope all women and all non-sexist men become aware of such unpalatable occurrences and band together to stop them. The tournament did not have to continue that way if there had been a group of women or men participants who had demanded that the slander stop.

Linda McCoy
psych., grad.

Program helps

I am a HEP (High School Equivalency Program) student and I would like to express my feelings on the program they serve to people who qualify.

HEP is one of the most fantastic things that has ever happened to

me. This program has helped me find what I wanted most out of life.

The program lets you be on your own most of the time. But you do have some supervision. The program allows you to find yourself. They let you make your own decisions (with good encouragement from them).

Of course, after the program you are free to be a bum, you are free to be whatever you want. But after you leave the program, you have a good feeling inside, like you have accomplished one of the

most important goals in your life. So after you accomplish this most important goal, you will want to go further into education, or get a job that is really worthwhile.

Before I came to HEP, I really felt lost, unwanted, with no one to talk to. But since I have been here, I have made many new life friends. The staff here at HEP has really made me feel wanted. And they have helped me realize that this is only the beginning of my life. And believe me, I have made my plans to further my education in

nursing school and become something besides just another one of those drop-outs.

HEP is an excellent program and I'm sure every student that goes through the program can say the same as I have. I would like to see HEP continue for many years to come so that more people who are in the same shoes as I, can get as much out of the program as I did.

Terry Grates
UO HEP student

Monday, May 3, 1976